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This study investigates the causes of fear of crime amongst residents of Ward 33 in KwaZulu-Natal, and the impact of this fear on their behaviour; the relationship between social cohesion and fear of crime; how residents are trying to make themselves safer in their own homes; and whether these measures are indeed producing feelings of greater safety and security. The research methodology employed for this dissertation is mainly qualitative, in particular the use of storytelling and photographs, which were used as a “can-opener” to get respondents to discuss their security choices as well as the choices made by others. The findings indicate that the sources and extent of fear of crime vary amongst residents. Fear of crime emanates from the physical and social environment as well as the kinds of information shared within communities. Embedded within the narratives is a strong association of race with crime, which is deepening divisions in the ward. The findings also question whether greater heterogeneity automatically reduces social cohesion. As far as home security is concerned, the northern part of the ward is generally more affluent and this is reflected in the more diverse security measures adopted by residents. In discussing the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), which is based on the idea that crimes are less likely to occur when properties are visible, residents' attitudes tended to vary according to their respective fear of crime, their financial status, and specific location within the ward. A theme running consistently through the literature and in some of the narratives is the effect of geography on how residents and potential criminals view an area. The regeneration of some parts of the ward and neglect of others shows the differential outcomes when local community members choose whether or not to be proactive and participate in such projects.
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Table 1: Population, Ward 33

Figure 1: Map showing key locations within ward 33

Figure 2: The Bulwer Park revitalisation project incorporates elements of CPTED such as the park bench with studs which aims to discourage skateboarders from acts of vandalism such as riding on park benches.

Figure 3: Wider pathways and additional street lighting were an important part of the Bulwer Park project in order to reduce criminal activity.

Figure 4: Bulwer Park outdoor gymnasium

Figure 5: Bulwer Park Market, bringing activity to the area through a robust open space (CPTED)

Figure 6: Home in Umbilo. Low / no wall and little vegetation makes it easy to see what is going on and it is also easy for the residents to keep a watch on the street and be aware of what is going on. Low WALLS, landscape and paving patterns make this a CPTED-friendly home.

Figure 7: Umbilo home that does not have walls or other signage. This home is very open, easily accessible to passers-by and provides natural surveillance which allows neighbours and passers-by to keep a check on what is going on.

Figure 8: House in Glenwood fortified with a high wall.

Figure 9: House with a low boundary wall.

Figure 10: Fortified wall in Glenwood. Electric fencing is visible to all, and passers-by are made aware of the internal security system through the ‘Chubb’ sign. Residents and others, however, have reasonable visibility on the upper levels as a result of the see-through palisade fencing.

Figure 11: This photo provides a good contrast. On the left is a house with high walls but one that has a degree of visibility because of the white see-through fencing, in direct contrast to the very high grey wall with no visibility.

Figure 12: A home with a low brick wall and a precast fence above it. It appears that this was done in stages as the owner became more crime conscious, possibly experienced crime or simply made these additions as a result of fear of crime.

Figure 13: Two homes in lower Glenwood. Brick columns are placed at various intervals with a palisade fence connecting them. Both homes are easily visible to their neighbours as the palisade fence provides natural surveillance. The homeowners have, however, installed electric fencing at the top as an additional measure, while the name of the security company is prominent.

Figure 14: House in Upper Glenwood with high walls.

Figure 15: Cropped version of Figure 14

Figure 16: Upper Glenwood home with a fortified wall and vegetation, which provides both privacy and security. While the wall is solid, it has reasonable visibility because of the height of the home.

Figure 17: A wall over six feet high in Glenwood, fortified with spikes at the top to prevent anyone climbing over, as well as a clear sign that the home is secured. There is a clear message to outsiders that there is a risk in selecting this home as a target for criminal activity. However, on the converse side, those on the outside have no idea of what is happening behind the solid walls while those on the inside will not know what is happening outside their boundaries unless they have cameras.

Figure 18: Street Map of Ward 33, Durban: Showing location of key informants

Figure 19: Community Policing Forum Meeting

Figure 20: King Edward VIII Hospital
Figure 21: Davenport Square, Glenwood
Figure 22: Refugees, Glenwood
Figure 23: Homeless Person, Glenwood
Figure 24: Neglected areas in Morans Lane, Berea
Figure 25: Abandoned Site (Clover Dairies), Umbilo
Figure 26: Abandoned Site (Clover Dairies), Umbilo
Figure 27: Homeless Person, Ward 33
Figure 28: Drugs and goods recovered by police
Figure 29: Map of Southway mall and Umbilo Park
Figure 30: Food & Craft Lovers Market, Bulwer Park
Figure 31: Map distinguishing the four CPF sectors within Ward 33
Figure 32: Chantal’s residence
Figure 33: Amy’s home and wall
Figure 34: Naomi’s backyard; Electric fencing was added to the existing security (wall)
Figure 35: Naomi’s home, additional security added
Figure 36: Naomi’s Patio, trellidors added
Figure 37: Michael’s residence
Figure 38: Susan’s home
Figure 39: Councillor Chapman’s residence
Figure 40: Ashley’s home and a few of her neighbours, Bartle Road (Umbilo)
Figure 41: Jessica’s home
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>African National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>Community Policing Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPTED</td>
<td>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSVR</td>
<td>Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Democratic Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUT</td>
<td>Durban University of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAA</td>
<td>Group Areas Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR</td>
<td>Growth, Employment and Redistribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNW</td>
<td>Glenmore Neighbourhood Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>International Community Unifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Integrated Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPID</td>
<td>Independent Police Investigative Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZNSA</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal Society of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO</td>
<td>Non-Profit Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>Public Order Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPS</td>
<td>South African Police Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Sustainable Cities International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIN</td>
<td>Sustainable International Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATSSA</td>
<td>Statistics South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAG</td>
<td>Umbilo Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBF</td>
<td>Umbilo Business Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCPF</td>
<td>Umbilo Community Policing Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKZN</td>
<td>University of KwaZulu-Natal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSAC</td>
<td>Overseas Security Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROFILE OF INTERVIEWEES

This study is based largely on qualitative research, in particular interviews with the following individuals who are involved in Ward 33 as residents, local councillors, police officers, or private security personnel.

Susan is a working woman in her 50s. She has lived in two different locations in Glenwood in the southern part of the area for the past six years. Susan has experienced several break-ins but does not have a high wall.

Michael is in his 60s, semi-retired, and has lived in Glenmore since 1978. He has experienced three robberies and does not have a high wall.

Warrant Officer Percy is in his early 50s. He has worked at Umbilo SAPS for the past three decades and was able to comment on change over an extended period.

Sarah is in her 40s and is working part-time. She has lived in Lower Glenwood close to Bulwer Road for the past 15 years and is a former member of the UCPF.

Mary is in her late 50s. She has worked at the Durban University of Technology and currently works at UKZN. She experienced a traumatic robbery at her home in 2012. Mary has lived in the northern part of the ward since the 1980s. She has extensive security.

Jessica is in her early 40s and lives and works in Umbilo. She has been living there for the past 10 years.

Chantel is in her 50s. She has lived close to the Glenwood Buxtons shopping Centre for more than two decades. Chantel is single and works at UKZN.

Matt is in his early 40s and lives and works in Umbilo. He has been living in Umbilo for just over 10 years.

Captain Patrick is in his 50s. He joined the police force in 1983 and was based at Durban Central (previously C.R. Swart). He has worked at the Umbilo Police Station for six years.

Amy is in her 40s. A housewife, she has lived in north Glenwood for the past eight years. She previously lived in Sherwood. Amy has high walls and has experienced break-ins.

Naomi, in her 50s, lives in Glenwood in the middle part of the ward. A working woman, she moved to Durban from Cape Town in 2005.

Ashley is in her late 60s and is a retired grandmother. She lives in Carrington Heights but spends all day at her daughter’s house in Umbilo house-sitting. This is the southern part of the ward, and is working class. Ashley has an intimate knowledge of the ward over four decades.

Warwick Chapman, in his 40s, is a member of the Democratic Alliance. He was the Councillor for Ward 33 until June 2013 when he was redeployed to the party’s offices in Cape Town. He has a very good knowledge of ward 33 and was active in promoting CPTED.
Vanessa is in her 40s. She has lived in the southern part of Ward 33 for the past 20 years. She is a past member of the UCPF, founder of the NGO Umbilo Action Group, and currently (2013) the Dennis Brutus Community Scholar at the Centre for Civil Society, UKZN.

John works for a long established security company in Ward 33. He is in his late 30s and has been based in the area for the past four years.

Mathew is in his early 40s and works for a different security company from that of John. He has been based in the area for the past seven years.
On Freedom Day, I think of a visit I made last week to my nephew’s house to deliver a storybook, *Monkey Business*, for his children. I hadn’t been to his house for probably more than a year. When I got to the address, I had to look hard before I recognised his place. There was a fence up around the property and a motorised gate. I couldn’t get in. I had thought to slip the envelope under the door because I knew that my nephew and his wife would be at work. But I couldn’t get near the door. Ironically, Seetha Ray’s *Monkey Business*, set in Calcutta, depicts a rich man who, having locked himself out of his home, tries to climb over the high fence, slips and is caught on the gate by his clothes. He hangs there upside down until a poor man who makes his living on the street with trained monkeys that dance and sing, rescues him. I had no intention of clambering over the gate so I looked up and down for a neighbour to whom I could entrust the envelope, but all I saw were fences and security gates lining the street. They hadn’t been there the last time I had come this way. And I said to myself, “Welcome to the new South Africa.” All the haves, and that includes me, are living in their own home-made prisons and all the have-nots are marching towards the official ones. And today we celebrate Freedom Day.

- Muthal Naidoo (27 April 2005)

Now in her seventies, playwright, actress and writer Muthal Naidoo has long been a critical voice in South Africa. During the 1970s and 1980s, she spoke out against apartheid through her acting and writing in the alternative theatre movement. In the post-apartheid period, she remains a voice of conscience through her blogs (http://www.muthalnaidoo.co.za) and regularly speaks out against corruption, poverty, crime and criminalisation, and a host of other subjects. In this evocative piece of writing she succinctly captures how so many South Africans are placing their faith in walls and fences to take care of their security, in a context of extreme inequality which, she has often argued, is exacerbating the crime problem, and resulting in an ever increasing prison population. Naidoo also subtly raises the question of whether those living behind walls and fences are not, ironically, “imprisoning” themselves and restricting their own freedom through the adoption of conspicuous security systems.

Crime, violence, and a corrupt police force are some of the issues that preoccupy South Africans in the contemporary period. The works of Anthony Altbeker and Jonny Steinberg, amongst others, address some of the issues related to crime, policing and criminal justice in post-apartheid South Africa. Altbeker’s *Fruit of a Poisoned Tree: A true story of murder and the miscarriage of justice* (2010), *The Dirty Work of Democracy* (2005), and *A Country at War with Itself* (2007), which speak to issues of crime, violence, and policing in South Africa and how to address these problems, resonate with ordinary South Africans and are best-selling books. Jonny Steinberg’s works such as *Midlands* (2001), *The Number* (2003), and *Thin Blue*

---

1 In 2008, South Africa had the world's seventh highest number of prisoners. The World Prison Brief placed South Africa's total of 166 267 prisoners after the United States (2.3 million inmates), China (1.6 million), Russia (888 014),
(2008) are award winning explorations of crime, violence, the police, and the judicial system in South Africa. The popularity of these works underscores many South African’s concerns about such issues. Although Steinberg and Altbeker are political scientists, their well-researched and theorised works have, unusually, made their mark in both the scholarly and popular markets.

The concern about crime and corruption reflected in these works is borne out by various studies and surveys. According to the World Competitiveness Report for 2010-2011, South Africa ranked 137 out of 139 countries in terms of the business costs of violence and 104th with regard to lack of trust in police competency. South Africa recorded an average of 50 murders, 330 armed robberies, 550 violent assaults, and 100 rapes each day during 2009 (Schwab, 2010-2011: 41).

The ‘Victim of Crime Survey 2011’, produced by Statistics South Africa, found that more than half (53 percent) of all South African households surveyed perceived housebreaking/burglary to be the most common type of crime, followed by home robbery, street robbery, and pick-pocketing; a third of households avoided going unaccompanied into open spaces such as parks because of their fear of crime. Only 20 percent felt ‘safe’ walking alone when it was dark, and around half the households surveyed took physical measures (as many as 64.7 percent in the Western Cape and 64.8 percent in Gauteng) to protect their homes. These ‘physical measures’ are not specified but only 11 percent of homes employed the services of a security company, while others used a range of measures that included burglar guards, alarm systems, security fences, and walls. The survey also suggested a disjuncture between individuals’ perceptions and their actual experiences of crime, with considerably lower incidences of victimisation recorded than suggested by perceptions. Housebreaking/burglary, for example, was experienced at least once by only 4.5 percent of those surveyed and home robbery by 2.6 percent. The survey found that a third of house break-ins/burglaries occurred at night (30.2 percent). As far as home entry is concerned, it found that in 43 percent of cases, burglars gained entry through a smashed door, while 34.5 percent gained entry through a window. In 56.2 percent of instances, the perpetrators used physical force. The survey found that of those killed, an astonishing 68 percent were murdered by persons known to them (such as a spouse/lover, friend/acquaintance, or domestic worker). This is particularly relevant given the extent to which South Africans seek to fortify their homes against “strangers”.

National crime statistics for the period April 2011 to March 2012 were released in September 2012. The most striking statistic was that more than 40 000 residential burglaries occurred during this period, an increase of 4 percent over the previous year. This suggests that people’s fears of home intrusions may be justified. Analysing these statistics, Johan Burger of the Institute for Security Studies attributed the increase in property crimes, in part, to ‘the economic meltdown’. He suggested that less sophisticated criminals were likely to ‘resort to burglaries in order to avoid contact crimes.’ In the same report, David Bruce, an independent crime researcher, observed that most property crimes tended to occur in less affluent areas as middle to higher income homes and businesses were investing in private security (The Mercury, 21 September 2012). Given the class disparities in Ward 33, this hypothesis will be tested in this study.
Following the release of these police crime statistics in September 2012, a weekend newspaper carried a two page spread with a sensational headline: ‘Home owners have no choice but to beef up security in KZN.’ The subtitle read: ‘KZN is the murder capital of the nation.’ Criminologist Hema Hargovan was quoted as saying that the statistics did not reflect the true impact of crime because they did not take into account ‘secondary victimization.’ She stated that even those who witness ‘crime are also victims. They also have to endure post-traumatic stress, but this is never accounted for.’ Furthermore, criminal activity also impacts those who are not directly affected. Simone Stanley of Blue Security told reporter Mervyn Naidoo that his clients were ‘opting for more upmarket security features. It’s a clear indication that they are afraid.’ Whereas in the past residents were reluctant to display security companies’ signage, they were now ‘asking for more. And they want all the bells and whistles; electric fences, perimeter systems and closed circuit TV cameras’ (Sunday Tribune, 23 September 2012).

Without doubt, this newspaper report speaks to the real fears and responses of suburban dwellers. However, what is lacking is an analysis that allows for an interpretation and interrogation of what people do, say, and feel in response to statistical evidence and lived experiences of crime. Most academic studies have found, however, that South Africans are indeed imprisoned by fear and the possibility of victimisation.

The tragedy, as implied by Mutha Naidoo, is that real freedom is elusive for many South Africans. South Africa’s first non-racial democratic election in 1994 was greeted with great euphoria as it brought to an end more than three centuries of violent confrontation for control of South Africa. Most South Africans looked forward to a period of political peace and economic prosperity. The Black majority, in particular, saw the coming to power of the African National Congress (ANC) as a signal that they would finally experience the fruits of their struggles for houses, education, running water, electricity, and other amenities that most white South Africans had taken for granted. This elation was short lived for several reasons. While political violence aimed at seizing control of the state has receded since 1994, ‘non-political violence’ related to crime, vigilantism, service delivery protests, and xenophobia has escalated. Harris notes that ‘high levels of violence continue to mark the society; and mistrust, suspicion and fear define many inter-personal relationships. Contrary to the popular representation of South Africa as a "miracle" nation, high levels of violence testify that a post-apartheid South Africa is not conflict-free’(Harris, 2001: 1).

A substantial number of South Africans (according to Statistics South Africa (STATSSA), the official unemployment rate was 25.3 percent in the third quarter of 2012) have become disillusioned by the imposition of anti-poor policies following the adoption of the neoliberal Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) strategy in 1996, which emphasised macroeconomic stabilization and a cut in government consumption, limited wage increases, import and trade liberalisation, foreign investment, and privatisation (Terreblanche, 1999). Basic services such as education, electricity, water, and housing came under the rule of the market, with local government playing a ‘facilitating' role between citizens and market forces, rather than serving a redistributive function. According to Sociologist Peter Alexander, the result is that South Africa 'has experienced a movement of local protests amounting to a rebellion of the poor. This has been widespread and intense, reaching insurrectionary proportions in some cases…. A key feature has
been mass participation by a new generation of fighters, especially unemployed youth but also school students [fuelled by] a sense of injustice arising from the realities of persistent inequality’ (Alexander, 2010-2011).

This study is not directly concerned with this aspect of the post-apartheid landscape except that it frames our understanding of crime and fear of crime. Many have linked increasing poverty and inequality in post-apartheid South Africa to crime (Fleming, 2011). New forms of segregation in the form of walls reinforce the divide between the haves and the have-nots. As the philosopher Costica Bradatvan (2011) observes, ‘walls are built for various reasons and they serve different purposes, but their function is always fundamentally the same: to create divisions, to prevent people and ideas from moving freely, and to legitimize differences.’ This creates the need to protect oneself from the ‘other’. Valji et al. point out that, walls and fences ‘have become the visible face of exclusion; a barrier between the haves and the have-nots…. This can fuel resentment and a sense of injustice on one side of the wall, and a sustained sense of entitlement and privilege on the other’ (2004:6).

As the ‘Victim of Crime’ survey quoted above suggests, there is a perception among many South Africans that the country is besieged by widespread violence. Those who experience crime and violence or read about it in the popular media believe that the state has failed to create a secure environment for citizens and residents. A 2006 national survey in South Africa found that 33 percent of urban respondents regarded unemployment as the government’s major priority, followed by crime and violence. Forty two percent of the respondents in the higher income group, which was defined as more than R8 000 per month regarded crime and violence as the highest priority (in CSVR, 2007: 30).

Such perceptions and concerns about crime and violence extend beyond ordinary South Africans. The influential Overseas Security Advisory Council (OSAC), which works in partnership with the US Department of State Bureau of Diplomatic Security, noted in its February 2012 report on Crime and Safety that crime levels in South Africa are phenomenally high and that South Africans are going to extraordinary levels to protect themselves:

*On a rating scale of low, medium, high, and critical, Pretoria, Johannesburg, Durban, and Cape Town are rated “critical” for crime…. In general, crimes continue to range throughout the full spectrum, from petty muggings and ATM scams to armed residential home invasions…. Violent, confrontational crime is a major concern in South Africa. Such crimes include home invasion robberies, burglaries, car-jackings, street muggings, smash-and-grabs, organized attacks on commercial and retail centers such as shopping malls and outlets, as well as attacks on cash-in-transit vehicles/personnel (i.e., armored car/personnel). Of particular concern for American citizens living in South Africa are home invasion robberies. These crimes are often violent in nature and can occur at any time in the day. In many cases, criminals prefer the occupant is home because the residential alarm is off and the occupant can identify where valuables are located…. Measures to combat home invasions should include several layers of residential security including perimeter walls, alarms, and grills on windows. Vehicle gates...*
should also be equipped with anti-lift brackets, as criminals have been known to use crowbars and pneumatic jacks to lift gates off their tracks…. Perhaps the most vulnerable point for any resident in South Africa is the residential driveway. Criminals use the driveway as a choke point, attacking victims when they are waiting for the vehicle gate to open. According to SAPS (South African Police Services), the majority of all carjacking incidents in South Africa occur as the victim arrives at home and pulls into the driveway, with the carjackers pulling up behind the victim in order to block an escape path. Victims who resist or fail to comply with demands may be killed or seriously injured. In the worst case scenarios, robbers force the victim into the house, rob the house of its valuables, and drive away with the loot (OSAC, 2012).

FOCUS OF THIS DISSERTATION

The central focus (research question) of this study is whether and how individuals are fortifying their homes as a result of their fear of crime, and whether they are feeling safer as a result of these measures. This question is investigated in this dissertation by focusing on three interrelated concerns. Firstly, it is concerned with how crime affects and even determines the way in which people try to make themselves safer in their own homes. The second focus is to examine the ways in which the suburban environment in South Africa is being constructed as a result of crime and fear of crime. Third, this dissertation interrogates whether the mechanisms used to create safety do in fact lead to greater feelings of safety and freedom. These issues will be understood in the context of scholarly work on crime prevention through environmental design.

Interest in this topic comes in part from the author’s personal experience of living in both Durban, South Africa, and in Brisbane, Australia between 2002 and 2011. In Brisbane, the houses did not have fences, high walls, or electric gates, while the front doors of homes were often left unlocked whilst residents were at home. Homes in the neighbourhood were occasionally burgled, but this was usually while the homeowners were out. Instances of people being violently assaulted or robbed at gunpoint were rare. Research conducted in Kuraby, a suburb of Brisbane, during 2011, found that 80 percent of the respondents felt ‘safe’ or ‘very safe’ walking in the area at night (Vahed, 2011: 33).

This was in huge contrast to my growing up in one of Durban’s dedicated middle class ‘Indian’ areas, Reservoir Hills, where security systems in our home increased incrementally during the 1990s in response to three break-ins. Initially there was no physical protection. The first break-in was followed by the installation of a security gate in the driveway; the second led to the installation of an alarm system; and the third led to a fence being built around the perimeter of the house. This was disliked by members of the household but seen as inevitable. Worse was to follow. Shortly after part of the family moved to Australia, on 24 May 2002, two maternal grand-aunts were brutally murdered in their home a few doors away. The Daily News headline that Friday, blazed: ‘University lecturer finds aunts murdered,’ in reference to the author’s father (a UKZN history lecturer) discovering the bodies. The house in which my grand-aunts had lived was sold, as was that of my grandparents who relocated to Johannesburg as it was deemed too “unsafe” for them to live alone.
Such personal experiences are not uncommon in South Africa which has one of the highest murder rates in the world, and whose citizens have a pervasive fear of crime which impacts on their everyday lives in degrees that correlate to their race and class standing (Davids & Gaibie, 2011). This dissertation examines the choices that residents in one part of Durban, Ward 33, are making about the boundaries surrounding their homes (called “target hardening” in the literature), and whether this has impacted in any way on their fear of crime or their direct experiences of crime. A large proportion of residents in Ward 33 have fortified their homes with high walls, and electric fencing. Those with less economic capital in Umbilo and lower Glenwood seem to have opted for open fences, low walls, or no boundaries at all. These are different responses to the same crime context; one of the aims of this dissertation is to examine whether the different technologies used to govern home security are having the desired effect in reducing fear of crime. Secondly, this study comments on how crime and the fear of crime are leading to new forms of social engineering in South Africa as a result of physical crime reduction strategies. While apartheid produced artificially engineered and segregated urban development, some academics suggest that fear of crime is shaping a segregated and atomised urban space in the post-apartheid period (Spinks, 2001: 3).

**THE STUDY SITE: WARD 33, DURBAN**

Ward 33, the site of this study, comprises of three suburbs – Umbilo, Glenmore and Glenwood – which are diverse in terms of their residents. While parts of Glenmore and Glenwood would be classified as ‘middle class’, Umbilo is largely a working class or lower middle class area. Glenwood is one of Durban’s oldest suburbs, with colonial-style mansions higher up in the vicinity of the University of KwaZulu-Natal as well as highly priced apartment blocks. The area has bustling business activity with the presence of the Glenwood and Davenport Centres and the St. Augustine’s hospital (shown in the map below). In the Bulwer, Ferguson, and Davenport Roads area, a number of homes have been converted into restaurants, boutiques, coffee shops, medical practices, and guest houses. Glenwood High, Durban Girls High, tree-lined streets, and parks all add to the image of order and affluence. There are many pedestrians and shoppers during the day.

Glenmore is to the south of Glenwood. The area comprises of free standing homes for middle to upper income people as well as cheaper priced apartment blocks. Unlike Glenwood, however, Glenmore does not have the same level of daytime retail business activity. Umbilo is a mainly middle to lower income suburb, further from the university and closer to the harbour area. The area has many free standing homes, which probably date to the 1920s and 1930s. Umbilo also lacks the day time business activity of Glenwood and the homes and grass verges are not as well maintained. The area also had / has many heavy duty businesses, in particular factories, in the Umbilo / Sydney Road areas and this adds to its feeling of being derelict and not as well maintained as Glenwood.

The differentiated class nature of these three adjacent suburbs allows for comparison in close and special proximity. It was visible, from walking and driving through the area, that different mechanisms are used to govern domestic security. In particular, the ways in which houses are “fenced off” vary substantially. Ward 33 (especially Glenwood) is very close to UKZN’s Howard College campus which made this research feasible and manageable.
KEY
1. KING EDWARD HOSPITAL
2. ST. AUGUSTINES HOSPITAL
3. DAVENPORT CENTRE
4. DALTON ROAD HOSTEL
5. UNIVERSITY OF KWA-ZULU NATAL
6. PIGEON VALLEY
7. UMBILO PARK
8. WOONGA PARK
9. MAYDON WHARF
10. CLOVER DAIRY SITE
11. MORANS LANE
12. FLAMINGO COURT
13. LANTERN HEATH
14. GLENWOOD SHOPPING CENTRE
15. EDEN COLLEGE

Figure 1: Map showing the Key locations within ward 33
Source: eThekwini Municipality, 2013 (adapted by author)
STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation is made up of the following chapters:

Chapter two reviews local and international literature on three areas of scholarly engagement: fear of crime, social cohesion, and CPTED principles, as well as the relationship between social cohesion, built environment and fear of crime. This aim of this chapter is to understand the sources of fear of crime and the consequences that this fear has on the behaviour of ordinary citizens and the kinds of actions that they are taking in response.

Chapter three describes the research methodology used to carry out research for this dissertation, in particular the use of storytelling and photographs. The discussion includes methods of data analysis, ethical concerns, the reliability and validity of these research methods, as well as issues raised during the fieldwork, including reflections on my own positionality as a (visibly) Muslim woman conducting interviews in historically ‘white’ suburbs.

Chapters four to six focus on three key themes that emerged from the interviews. Chapter four examines objective and subjective sources of the fear of crime and its impact on residents’ behaviour; Chapter Five focuses on social cohesion, diversity and responses to crime and the fear of crime; while Chapter Six focuses on measures that residents adopt to protect their homes, in particular the building of walls as a response to crime and the fear of crime.

Chapter seven summarises the main findings. It offers some concluding comments on the relationship between crime, the fear of crime, social cohesion, and the built environment; the implications of these findings for policymakers; and provides suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER TWO: BUILT ENVIRONMENT, SOCIAL COHESION & FEAR OF CRIME

There is a wide body of literature on crime in post-apartheid South Africa. Reference was made to some of these works in chapter one. This chapter seeks to understand the concept “fear of crime”, and the sources of this fear which affects both those who have been direct victims of crime as well as those who have not been affected by crime. This chapter also sets out the scholarly debates regarding the consequences that fear of crime have on the behaviour of ordinary citizens, and the kinds of actions that they are taking in response to this fear. In addition to fear of crime, this study draws on two other areas of scholarly work, namely, social cohesion and principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). This chapter provides a theoretical perspective of these three areas of scholarly engagement, and relates them to the topic of fear of crime.

FEAR OF CRIME

Fear of crime refers to the ‘fear of being a victim of crime as opposed to the actual probability of being a victim of crime’ (Hale, 1996: 83). It is ‘a pressing social and political issue in any number of countries across the world’ (Farrall et al., 2009: 3). High levels of fear of crime have been reported in South Africa. National surveys in the early 2000s consistently reported that around 60 percent of South Africans felt ‘very unsafe’, with the highest fear reported amongst minority groups (Naude, 2003). Fear, according to Smith and Pain, ‘is an emotional response to a material threat.’ People may be fearful of places, people, or actions that have harmed them or have the potential to harm them and seek to avoid this by all means necessary (Smith & Pain, 2009: 51). People who have been victimised or have knowledge of others who have been victims are usually more afraid (Box, Hale & Andrews, 1988). However, fear may also be a ‘condition that is only loosely related to material risks’ (Smith & Pain, 2009: 51). Grabosky makes the point that while fear may be the result of actual life experiences, in many cases it is not directly related to actual risk or victimisation. While some citizens’ fear of crime is well-founded, others ‘are at less personal risk than they might believe.’ In other words, fear of crime is distinct from crime and is a problem in its own right (Grabosky, 1995: 508). The challenge for government and policy makers and planners is to ‘work out what inspires levels of fear that are disproportionate to real risks, and address them in the interests of arriving at a less anxious world’ (Smith & Pain, 2008: 51) because crime and the fear of crime shape debates about “law and order” and how people attempt to govern their own security (including by shaping their physical environment).

IMPACT OF FEAR OF CRIME

According to Farrall, Jackson, and Gray (2009: 21), ‘pervasive insecurity about crime erodes well-being, promotes precaution, restricts movement, encourages “flight” from deprived areas, and harms social trust, inter-group relations, and the capacity of communities to exercise social control.’ Fear of crime may lead to higher levels of gun ownership (both legal and illegal), demands for tougher punishment and more punitive action from politicians and the public, some citizens avoiding being away from home at night, or the
creation of fortified living spaces (Roberts, 2008). It may also affect where people choose to live and how they construct the space in which they live in order to reduce both the fear of crime as well as actual victimisation. Radar (2004) has termed this perception of risk, combined with fear of crime and restrained behaviour, the ‘threat of criminal victimization’.

Wilson (1975; cited in Box, Hale & Andrews 1988: 340) concluded that fear of crime ‘fractures the sense of community and neighbourhood’ and divides ‘urban space into “safe” and “unsafe” areas’. Some individuals may seek to protect their property and themselves while others may relocate to a different neighbourhood (Sampson & Wooldredge, 1986; cited in Box, Hale & Andrews 1988: 341). People’s daily habits may even change. According to Box, Hale and Andrews (1988: 341), in order to protect themselves from dangers lurking outside, people ‘may stay at home more often and within safer environments or places which they have made safer through certain security measures, for example, locks, chains, bars and alarms.’

The impact of fear of crime depends on individuals’ experience of it. Farrall et al.’s (2009) empirical study investigated what fear of crime means as an everyday experience and what it expresses as a social attitude in the United Kingdom. They found that for those who live in high crime areas, and who may have had direct or indirect experience of victimisation, fear was a concrete and emotional, but short-lived, event. On the other hand, for those who lived in areas which experienced little crime, “fear” was a ‘mental state rather than mental event’ and a metaphor for various insecurities such as social cohesion, social change, and neighbourhood “breakdown” (Farrall et al., 2009: 22).

**IS FEAR OF CRIME INVENTED?**

Scholars have debated whether or not fear of crime is a legitimate area of research. It has been suggested that the concept “fear of crime” was “invented” because some individuals have a vested interested in this concept (Farrall & Lee, 2008: 1). Murray (2007) explains that the fear of crime concept has produced an industry where academics produce criminological knowledge around the concept and advocate crime policy, while individuals, households, governments, and communities, have used the crime concept as a device to rule. Ordinary citizens, as consumers, have been made to believe that they have to self-manage their insecurities, while local neighbourhoods and even whole communities tend to unite around shared anxieties. Insecurity may also provide governments with an opportunity to reassert their legitimacy (Box et al., 1988: 340).

Others contend that fear of crime is ‘a major social problem’ and therefore a legitimate area of research (Box et al., 1988: 340). Fear of crime originated during the politics of law and order in the US in the 1960s when the country was trying to cope with a vibrant civil rights movement, student protests, and anti-Vietnam War protests, as well as rising crime rates. According to Ditton and Farrell (2000: xv; in Gadd & Jefferson, 2007: 131), ‘public alarm about crime emerged, vis-a-vis the manipulation of the Nixonian silent majority, from right-wing concern about the extension of rights to the poor and the black.’ They further argue that ‘gradually over a 30 year period, general – if bigoted – societal concern about crime has been transmuted
into a personal problem of individual vulnerability.’

As the chapters that follow will illustrate, the interviews conducted for this study revealed that fear of crime is a real issue among the residents of Ward 33, many of whom express anxiety about crime, and about being victims of crime. The levels of fear of interviewees and the consequences of this fear were determined by various factors that are discussed in the chapters that follow.

FEAR OF CRIME PARADOX

The global literature on fear of crime has identified two contradictions. One is that there is a consistently high fear of crime even when crime rates are relatively low, and the second is that the group most at risk, young men, are least fearful of crime, while women, who are the most fearful, are least likely to be victims (Gadd & Jefferson, 2007: 126). The paradox is that those who are least likely to be affected by crime have the greatest fear (Lupton & Tulloch, 1999). One reason for this incongruity was provided by feminists who argued in the 1980s that patriarchy and racism were responsible for fear amongst women, ethnic minorities, and the urban working class. They related fear amongst women to abuse in domestic relations, and fear amongst minorities to the abuse that they encountered daily (Farrall & Lee, 2008: 2-3). Qualitative research on fear of crime, with its emphasis on giving voice to the ‘fearful experiences and practices of everyday life,’ points to a relationship between marginality and fear, with recorded levels of fear higher in poorer areas, and what has been referred to as ‘hidden harm’ in private spaces, which includes the fears of those who are victims of child abuse, domestic violence, Islamophobia and other forms of racist violence, violence against the homeless, and so on (Smith & Pain, 2009: 48).

Another explanation for this contradiction is that the questions used to measure fear of crime are sometimes ambiguous or unclear and the results may therefore not be reliable. For example, in Britain, respondents were asked, ‘how safe do you or would you feel about being out alone in your neighbourhood at night?’ They had to choose between ‘very safe,’ ‘fairly safe,’ a bit unsafe’ and ‘very unsafe’. This question has been criticised for failing to mention crime; it was also deemed to be geographically vague. Furthermore, it was asking about something that people may never do; it mixed the hypothetical with the real; and it assumed a consistency in feelings of fear (Gadd & Jefferson, 2007: 127).

Some academics and policymakers also emphasise that fear of crime cannot be studied in isolation and that we should move beyond people as victims of crime and analyse crime in relation to other insecurities amongst individuals. One study, for example, found that subjects who are already anxious are more likely to become fearful of fear of crime discourse (Gadd & Jefferson, 2007: 131). International concerns such as terrorism and global warming, and even national ones such as health care and the state of the economy, can produce ‘anxiety which might find an outlet in crime talk’ (Enders & Jennett, 2009: 202-203). Since the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre on 11 September 2001 and US president George Bush’s subsequent “war on terror”, research has shown that local fears are inspired by global events, such as among Muslims living in the West (Smith & Pain, 2009: 49).
Due to individuals’ uncertainties about the local, national and international social, political, and economic situation as a source of fear of crime, Lupton and Tulloch argue that little should be read into the disjuncture between fear and occurrence of crime. They believe that there is…

… too much emphasis on the question ‘How rational is people’s fear of crime?’, a question that largely reduces the complexity of the phenomenon and positions a “biased” lay response against an “expert” objective judgment. Individuals should rather be viewed as reflexive subjects who experience and respond to crime via communal, aesthetic and shared symbolic meanings. Fear of crime operates at a number of different levels of meaning and consciousness, emerging from and constantly reactive to direct personal experiences, knowledge about others’ experiences and mediated sources of information, and also fitting into broader narratives concerning anxieties about ‘the way society is today’ (Lupton & Tulloch, 1999: 507, 521).

Lupton and Tulloch suggest that it really does not matter if fear of crime does not meet the reality of crime. The fact is that fear of crime leads to particular responses and behaviours amongst certain people, even if there is no match between “real” crime and crime that is feared.

Dammert and Malone (2003) illustrate this in the case of Chile, which is considered relatively safe with low crime rates and an efficient and trustworthy police force, but has high rates of fear of crime. They ask, ‘Why are Chileans so fearful when their country is so safe?’ The answer, they argue, is that fear of crime does not reflect fear of actual criminal acts, but ‘is a manifestation of a wide range of … economic, social, and political insecurities featuring prominently in Chilean life today’. Scholars should study fear of crime not only as it relates to victimization and criminalization, but also in a context of insecurities generated by increasing rates of unemployment and poverty (Dammert & Malone, 2003: 89). Torrente adds that perceptions of social disorder cause fear while poorer people may be more vulnerable to crime and fear crime more because they have limited resources to deal with crime and the consequences of an attack (Torrente, 2002: 3).

‘MORAL PANICS’

The opening sentence of Stanley Cohen’s Folk Devils and Moral Panics underscores the fact that ‘societies appear to be subject, now and then, to periods of moral panic’ (Cohen, 2002: 1). Moral panics are usually found in societies ‘undergoing profound changes’ which are ‘prone, periodically, to overreact to “old” threats as if they were new and unprecedented, to scapegoat a few to protect threatened ways of life and to call for firm measures’ (Gadd & Jefferson, 2007: 128). Moral panics may appear when there is heightened concern over a real or imagined threat and a perception that governmental organisations such as the police and justice system lack the will or capacity to solve society’s problems. The relevance of this observation for the current study is that even people who may not be affected directly by crime may channel their energies into fighting something tangible such as crime in a context of widespread general insecurity.
Goode and Ben-Yehuda (1994) speak of “disproportionality”, which implies an exaggeration of the problem and the reaction to it. The mass media, politicians, and others may stereotype the problem and help to create “folk devils”, which may become dehumanised and come to be seen as the “other”, making it easier to employ extreme measures during “exceptional times”. It is very difficult, under these circumstances, to take a detached look at the problem, with the result that the solutions may exacerbate the problems. According to Gadd and Jefferson (2007: 130), the ‘threat [of crime] being responded to is used as a scapegoat for some other issue.’ Crime may become ‘a convenient scapegoat. Citizens can channel all their insecurities into fear of crime, as crime is a more tangible phenomenon than are other economic, political, and social insecurities’ (Dammert & Malone, 2006: 84). Farrall, Jackson and Gray (2009: 24) similarly argue that the ‘root of fear of crime may be public unease about the health of local neighbourhood order, as well as broader anxieties about the pace and direction of social change exemplified by concerns about social decline, community fragmentation, and moral authority.’

The demise of apartheid in 1994 in South Africa ushered in African majority rule and challenged minority groups in particular in various ways. Many feel marginalised and question whether there is a place for them in the new order. The global order has also changed dramatically, with the pervasive phenomenon of globalisation affecting people economically as well as culturally. The lifting of trade barriers, for example, has resulted in cheap imports and widespread job losses; porous borders have led to massive immigration, some of it illegal; the abolition of influx control has resulted in mass migration to the cities and the mushrooming of informal settlements; while job reservation and racial boundaries in school, on the beach, and in parks has ended. Writing specifically about urban South Africa, Steinberg observes that ‘paramilitary policing in the name of crime prevention … acts in ways that respond to age-old fears. The fear that young men have run amuck,.… fear of the city being deluged by outsiders…. Post-apartheid policing transmogrifies these difficulties of urban life into matters of crime, matters that are dealt with by theatrical displays of police action’ (Steinberg, 2011: 359).

POSTMODERN INSECURITY

Zygmunt Bauman’s work on the insecurities of postmodernity is also relevant. He points out in a 2005 interview that in contrast to the project of modernity which aimed to create ‘a world without fear’ and which culminated in the social state, ‘which … was about a society taking responsibility for each citizen, offering him or her a life free of fear,’ the postmodern world is full of fear and uncertainty:

“In today’s world people have many reasons to fear. We can easily create a catalogue of risks which a young person faces today, yet it is impossible to complete this catalogue because the real causes of fear are dispersed and unclear and very difficult to define, which makes them even more threatening…. We could list thousands and thousands of these liquid elements in today’s reality which threaten to sink you. They all cause some kind of general angst, all the more so because the map of this fear is faded and unclear. The more dispersed and indefinite is this fear, the more desperate is the search for concrete objects or persons who can be blamed for it. The big advantage of transferring this general level of existential uncertainty to the more concrete level of personal safety is that one finally recognises what to
do. I can put better locks on my doors, or a monitoring system around my house, sensors that recognise every stranger who approaches…. I cannot prevent my company, who gave me my occupation and my family the means of existence, from moving to Bangalore – but when I see a suspicious person overdressed in a thick coat or carrying a suspicious package, I can go to a policeman, or at least point that suspicious person out. When I get on a bus and see someone with olive skin digging in his bag, I can go and alarm the bus driver. I am no longer helpless (Bauman, 2005).

Elsewhere, Bauman has argued that valorising individual choice over collective social and economic security is producing apprehension among many individuals. In modern liberal societies, people sacrificed some of their individual liberties for collective economic security whereas in the postmodern period, individual choice takes precedence over collective security. This is producing anxiety that finds an outlet in a focus on crime and its control. The rise of exclusion and fortification, whether at individual, community, or national levels, reflects our failure to cope with the challenge of existential insecurity resulting from postmodern social and economic arrangements (Bauman, 2000: 211).

Studies show that the lack of social support is exacerbating fear of crime. People who are isolated generally feel more afraid (Box, Hale & Andrews, 1988). According to Hartnagel (1979; in Box, Hale & Andrews, 1988: 342), ‘people without friends in the neighbourhood will probably fear crime more because they feel they would be unable to cope with it’. Ironically, while demanding more security, people are simultaneously dispensing with traditional institutions of security. Women going out to work impacts on family structure, as does the move towards nuclear families, and the increase in the number of people living alone (Torrente, 2002: 4). Another factor adding to people’s uncertainty is the increased number of migrants, which leads to cultural and racial diversity and often manifests in acts of xenophobia (Torrente, 2002: 6).

Judging by call-in programmes to radio stations and letters to newspapers, South Africans display many insecurities; ranging from concerns about high crime rates, to excessive unemployment, the performance of the currency, the eccentricities of the ANC government, and affirmative action policies in the case of minority groups. These insecurities provide the broader context in which fear of crime should be viewed. Bauman (2000: 213) argues that in this context many people seek sanctuary in their homes, which are seen as a ‘body-safe extension… [It] has become the passkey to all doors which must be locked and sealed.’ The philosopher Costica Bradatvan writes that, in a world of uncertainty, people seek assurance in walls:

**In a world of uncertainty and confusion, a wall is something to rely on; something standing right there, in front of you — massive, firm, reassuring. With walls come mental comfort, tranquility and even a vague promise of happiness. Their sheer presence is a guarantee that, after all, there is order and discipline in the world.**

In contrast, Farrall & Lee (2008: 5) argue that when people fortify themselves behind walls, it further heightens their fears and reinforces the belief that they are ‘at risk’.
One of the concerns of this study is to interrogate whether higher walls and greater securitisation of individual homes, evident in parts of Ward 33, are related to these insecurities and, if so, whether they are proving to be effective.

### POLICING AND THE PRIVATISATION OF SECURITY AND SPACE

Attitudes towards state structures also impact on fear of crime. When citizens have confidence in their police force and believe that the police are efficient and are likely to capture criminals, they are less likely to fear crime (Krahn & Kennedy, 1985 in Box; Hale & Andrews, 1988). Fear of crime may increase where citizens lack confidence in the police. This is compounded by the move to private and citizen-based security provision as the state encourages citizens to participate in security through ‘community policing forums’ and ‘neighbourhood watches’. As Kempa and Singh point out, the moves towards community policing ‘reflect and propagate shifts from welfare liberal to neo-liberal rationalities of governance’ of security ‘at-a-distance’ (Kempa & Singh, 2008: 335). Citizens are turning inward and to the market for solutions, hence the mushrooming of the private security industry. Many homes have signs indicating that a particular security company provides ‘rapid armed response’ or patrols the suburb (Lemanski, 2006: 790).

The emergence of ‘mass private property’ which is used as public spaces (such as gated communities, shopping malls, and industrial complexes), where landlords have the legal right to employ private security providers, has also increased demand for and the utilisation of private security (White, 2011: 88). Private security companies’ marked vehicles, badges, and uniforms resemble those of the state and ‘are indicative of an attempt to secure legitimacy by association’ (White, 2011: 93). According to Kempa and Singh (2008: 35), this ‘has been interpreted as the neo-liberal dish running away with the spoon: once mobilised by the state, those members of the public with sufficient wherewithal have sought greater control over their policing by purchasing largely repressive and coercive policing services directly from the private security industry.’ Businesses connected to the security industry (security alarms, electric fences, walls, burglar-proofed windows, etc) may also exaggerate threats of crime in order to sell their products. This may not be a deliberate sales strategy on their part but citizens’ insecurity may inadvertently increase because private security provision could heighten the feeling of living under siege (White, 2011: 93).

### MEDIA AND FEAR OF CRIME

Farrall and Lee ask the important question, ‘Where “is” the fear of crime, what does it “do”?’ In other words, what are the sources of fear of crime and what is the impact of this fear on individuals as well as the wider society? One source of fear of crime may be the crime surveys conducted by Government and private agencies which are fed to the media and the wider population. These findings, which may not be accurate, nevertheless become a discourse around which the wider population makes sense of their day-to-day lives. They also put pressure on government to act on crime, especially when it becomes an election issue (Farrall & Lee, 2008: 5). The murder, hijacking, or robbery of people one is close to or even strangers may be used by political parties, business, and the media to reinforce the message that citizens are at risk (Farrall & Lee, 2008: 5). As Smith and Pain point out, politicians tend to play to the ‘fears of middle class, white suburbanites, while validating and reinforcing them’ (Smith & Pain, 2009: 51). Various stakeholders
may try to concoct fear of crime for their own short term gains, such as attracting readers to newspapers or votes for politicians, and this is often reflected in strong law enforcement campaigns.

The media may also play a role in bolstering fear of crime through sensational reporting. People obtain data about crime from various sources, with the media being a major source of information. Read any daily or weekly newspaper and it is bound to have articles on crime. Is there a relationship between mass media reporting and the fear of crime? There is a body of literature that argues that the reporting of “shock events” and non-interpreted crime statistics heightens crime fears (Farrall & Lee, 2008: 6). Disproportionate coverage of crime in the media may lead people to believe that levels of crime are higher than they actually are, thus increasing their fear. Media representations of crime, together with perceptions of a failing criminal justice system, and police crackdowns, can increase fear of crime and create a ‘moral panic’ (Smith & Pain, 2009: 51). Smith and Pain (2009: 53) observe that it is often the case that ‘isolated events of criminality and victimization become a frenzy of demonization and vulnerabilities, and feed into a politics of repression.’ Media coverage, particularly on television, tends to depict a world riddled with crime. Furthermore, it depicts a ‘mean world’ that is ‘uncivil, violent and threatening,’ rather than one that is ‘orderly and secure’. Constant exposure to this ‘distorted’ view of the world may lead audiences to adopt it as their own (Lupton & Tulloch, 1999: 509). Fear can have a momentum of its own as it becomes disconnected from actual material risk.

The relationship between media reporting and fear of crime is, however, complex. The academic study of the effects of mass media on viewers was influenced by two theories, mass society theory and behaviourism, the former originating from sociology and the latter from psychology. Broadly, both theories adopted the view that human beings are unstable and susceptible to external influences (Jewkes, 2010: 10). While this perspective tended to dominate the academy in the US for much of the twentieth century, scholars in the UK were reluctant to postulate a direct causal link between media images and people’s behaviour. Their belief was that multiple factors influence behaviour. Jewkes (2010: 14-15) implores researchers to take into account ‘the subtleties of media meanings, the polysemy of media texts (that is, they are open to multiple interpretations), the unique characteristics and identity of the audience member, and the social and cultural context within which the encounter between media text and audience member occurs.’ People’s ideas about issues such as ‘violence’ and ‘deviance’ may also differ, while it is possible that viewers’ concerns may actually determine what the media places emphasis on, rather than the converse. Despite these shortcomings, the idea that media influences behaviour and attitudes persists among many academics as well as laypersons.

From a Marxist perspective, the media, under the control of the ruling bourgeois elite, furthers the interests of that class. According to Jewkes (2010: 18), radical criminologists emphasised ‘the role of the media in orchestrating public panics about crime and deflecting concerns away from the social problems that emanate from capitalism.’ The increasing concentration of media ownership in a few large corporations lends weight to the argument that the media is highly influential in shaping the perspectives of ordinary citizens. Concentration of ownership limits the kind of material available to the public while the focus on media “ratings” usually results in the dissemination of commercially viable stories (“populist”). Linguist and
media critic, Noam Chomsky argued that the media serves the military-industrial complex by under-representing certain stories and over-representing others (Jewkes, 2010: 21). Marxist-oriented scholars suggest that media shapes people’s understanding of crime as well as criminalisation. One feature, for example, is the narrow definition of crime. ‘Street’ crime waves may be manufactured while corporate crimes are ignored; if reported, they may be portrayed as exceptional (Jewkes, 2010: 24-25).

‘Reception analysis’, which was the dominant theoretical perspective in media studies during the 1980s and 1990s, argued that media was not an influence beyond people’s control but that it was a resource ‘consciously used by people…. Audience members select images and meanings that relate to their sense of self-identity or to their wider experiences of work, family and social relationships.’ Put another way, the focus was not on what the media does to people, but on what people do with the media (Jewkes, 2010: 27). Citizens are not malleable individuals who simply accept, and are influenced by, what they read. This view was augmented by postmodernism which viewed people as ‘active and creative meaning-makers.’ The democratisation of the media in the contemporary period means that people have wide choices about where to access their information. Consequently, there is an emphasis in the media on how information is packaged. Sensationalism, rather than deep analysis and contextualisation, takes precedence as people seek immediate consumption and fulfillment (Jewkes, 2010: 29). Issues of crime may be portrayed in sensational fashion without contextualising them.

Studies on the effect of the media on citizens’ perceptions have reported mixed results. One study, for example, found that people who read regularly about sensational crime in newspapers have greater fear (Williams & Dickinson, 1993), while a study by Liska and Baccaglini (1990: 372) found that newspaper coverage of crime in other towns and neighbourhoods makes people feel ‘safe by comparison’ in their place of residence. Characteristics such as the sensationalism of reporting, the randomness of the crime, the amount of coverage given to an incident, location of the crime, and whether anyone was harmed, all influence public reaction to the reporting and the production of fear of crime (Heath & Gilbert, 1996).

It is clear that multiple factors play a role in determining the levels of fear that result from the media’s portrayal of crime. While the media reaches out to the masses, its impact on fear of crime is unclear.

**SOCIAL COHESION, CRIME & FEAR OF CRIME**

Social cohesion is regarded by many academics and policymakers as indispensable to reduce crime and the fear of crime. Farrall, Jackson and Gray (2009: 26) propose that ‘fear of crime operates less as an irrational and misplaced public sense of the crime problem and more as a lay seismograph or barometer of social cohesion and moral consensus.’ Thus, societies that are socially cohesive should register lower levels of fear of crime. There is no commonly accepted working definition of the term, which may refer to economic wellbeing, democratic citizenship, or even solidarity, depending on who is using the term and in what context.
As used by French sociologist, Emile Durkheim, social cohesion describes the interdependent connections that hold together the various elements that constitute a society (Ellwell, 2003). For Kearns and Forrest (2000), social cohesion includes several constituent elements: common values and a civic culture; social order and social control; social solidarity and a reduction in wealth disparities; social networks and social capital; and territorial belonging and identity. In most definitions of social cohesion, the notion of shared values is central. According to the Council of Europe (1999: 2; In Beauvais & Jenson, 2002), social cohesion ‘comprises a sense of belonging: to a family, a social group, a neighbourhood, a workplace, a country or, why not, to Europe.’ Social cohesion is, however, seen by some as being under threat from globalisation which tends to widen wage differentials and increase inequality; new technologies, which allow for virtual mobility; and diversity, with migration leading to greater religious, ethnic, class and religious diversity (Beauvais & Jenson, 2002: 18-25).

At national level, Freda Adler’s (1983) study of the relationship between social cohesion and crime rates is relevant. Adler sought to explain low crime rates in ten countries viz. Ireland, Japan, Bulgaria, Nepal, Switzerland; (then) East Germany; Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Peru, and Costa Rica, which had widely differing social, political and economic characteristics but which enjoyed several common features which Adler termed ‘synnomie’. These included widespread respect and support for the criminal justice system and a ‘strong family system’ which was complemented by educational, religious, and ‘community’ institutions which functioned as a surrogate family (Adler, 1983: 131-133). Together, they ‘transmit[ted] and maintain[ed] values by providing for a sharing of norms and by ensuring cohesiveness’ (Adler, 1983: 130). Adler attributed low crime primarily to cohesion and shared values.

In a subsequent study, Adler (1995), whose theoretical framework and analysis draws heavily on the Durkheimian framework, stated that societies could be placed on a progressive scale which ranged from synnomie to anomie. Higher social cohesion led to greater social order and lower crime, while low cohesion led to greater social problems and higher crime. Adler added that, as a general rule, solidarity weakens as societies progress, with divergent groups and values emerging, some of which are more dominant than others. As traditional institutions such as the family and religion weaken, so does social cohesion. Adler’s work has been criticised on several fronts, including its assumption that ‘traditional’ societies are truly crime-free, problems in defining low and high crime societies, and incorrectly reported crime rates (White, 2011: 94).

While it may be difficult to reach consensus on the issue of social cohesion at more macro levels, many theorists find utility in the concept at local community level where social networks and social capital are arguably most evident. Social cohesion, according to Torrente, does not ‘mean social uniformity: On the contrary, it means to protect cultural diversity and personal liberty finding basis for living daily together peacefully. It implies social justice, community involvement, and human solidarity.’ When citizens feel isolated and excluded, they feel unsafe. Residents in large urban areas may feel less safe than those living in small towns due to such anonymity (Torrente, 2002: 2).
Where low social cohesion exists, people are more likely to feel unsafe and create physical boundaries, such as high walls around individual properties, to protect themselves. Such methods may further undermine social cohesion by keeping ‘unwanted’ neighbours at bay (Young, 1999). Markowitz et al. (2001), whose study is based on British Crime Surveys for 1984, 1988 and 1992, concluded similarly: ‘The results suggest a feedback loop in which decreases in neighborhood cohesion increase crime and disorder, increasing fear, in turn, further decreasing cohesion.’

Social capital is regarded as a key ingredient in building social cohesion. Chidester, Dexter and James (2003: 324) define social capital as ‘social networks, informed by trust, that enable people to participate in reciprocal exchanges, mutual support and collective action to achieve shared goals.’ As Chidester, Dexter and James (2003: 334) observe, ‘extraordinary claims have been made about the benefits of social capital…. Listening to these claims, we are assured that social capital will enable government to cultivate the trust of citizens, to implement effective development programmes and even to solve a wide range of social problems from crime prevention to health provision.’ They warn that achieving these benefits is more difficult in practice.

Enders and Jennett, borrowing from Robert Putnam, use the term ‘social capital’ to refer to ‘those features of social life that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives.’ Important aspects of social capital include ‘networks of civic engagement’, ‘norms of generalized reciprocity’, and ‘relations of social trust’. This includes such things as being involved in local religious, educational, or sporting organisations, participating in street carnivals and fetes, and knowing people in the neighbourhood. Higher social capital usually leads to lower rates of fear of crime within communities (Enders & Jennett, 2009: 202-203). Putnam (2000) argues that there has been a decline in social capital in the US since the mid-1960s. This is reflected in such tendencies as the drop in formal membership and participation in civic organisations and charitable giving. The reasons include time constraints, work commitments, the participation of women in the workforce, television and the internet, changes in family structure, suburbanisation and residential mobility.

Kruger et al. (2007: 483) point out that before post-World War II suburbanisation, urban areas in the US comprised of household residences and locally-owned shops which had strong social cohesion and social capital. The public presence of residents helped to deter crime by keeping an “eye” on those likely to get into trouble. When the urban population moved into suburbs from the 1950s onwards, many urban areas were demolished and government housing projects were erected in their place. The structure of these houses made social monitoring difficult. Furthermore, many local neighbourhood stores shut down and residents were forced to move out of the neighbourhood to seek work. This, they argue, in part explains the rising crime rates during the period of transition in these neighbourhoods and subsequently. ‘Neighborhood trust and solidarity,’ they point out, ‘influences residents’ willingness to intervene for the common good…. Community interventions promoting communication and cooperation among neighbors, and thus enhancing social capital, may be effective in reducing fear of crime’ (Kruger, 2007: 494).
In her 1961 study, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Jane Jacobs pointed to the effects that urban renewal strategies were having on local community safety. Isolated neighbourhoods and minimised interaction between residents was undermining natural surveillance and people’s sense of ownership of particular areas. This led to increased crime levels. For Jacobs, crime levels could be reduced through high pedestrian activity, the diverse use of cities, and clearly defined public and private spaces. There is a vicious cycle: ‘When people are afraid of being in streets and they leave them empty, more crime is committed and more fear appears’ (Torrente, 2002: 3).

The community decline theory suggests that street crime reduces informal surveillance by increasing residents’ perception of risk and fear. As the possession of firearms and drug use increases, surveillance may be limited because community members are more fearful of leaving the safety of their homes, resulting in fewer volunteers to maintain the social order of the neighbourhood (Wilson, 1996: 1). Conversely, the systemic model of crime defines community organisation as a ‘complex system of friendship and kinship networks and formal and informal associated ties rooted in family life and ongoing socialization processes’ (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974). Neighbourhood composition can increase or hinder the development of social networks. Residents are more likely to actively and informally police social activity in an interconnected, close-knit neighbourhood, resulting in lower rates of street crime (Bellair, 2000: 137).

People’s emotional attachment to an area, or their (intangible) sense of community, may very well reduce crime and the fear of it as they feel in control of their neighbourhood, which consequently feels safer than it may really be. Conversely, residents who do not have social links to the youth in the local community or who distrust neighbours tend to be more fearful (Schweitzer et al., 1999).

However, a negative (perhaps unintended) consequence is that social cohesion may exclude certain people, based on race, ethnicity, gender, language, class or nationality, from particular neighbourhoods or even within the fabric of the nation state. This can have a deleterious long term social impact.

The concept of social cohesion is relevant to this study because policymakers, law enforcement agencies, academics, and politicians are often heard arguing that “social cohesion" is key to reducing crime and the fear of crime in South Africa. Chidester et al. (2003: 325), for example, state that in post-apartheid South Africa *ubuntu* signifies ‘mutual, reciprocal recognition of humanity’, and provides a basis for social cohesion. One of aims of this study is to interrogate the ‘reality’ of social cohesion in the specific location of Ward 33. Do residents, for example, feel part of a cohesive local community and do they consequently look out for each other? Or do they feel isolated and consequently barricade themselves, and is this exacerbating fears of crime? These are some of the concerns of this study.
The final part of this chapter examines the intersection between the built environment, fear of crime and social cohesion. This dissertation draws on the extensive literature on the relationship between feelings of safety and environmental design. Pioneered by criminologist, C. Ray Jeffrey in the 1970s, this literature focuses on how and whether the built environment can assist in reducing crime and fear of crime. Jeffrey believed that a successful crime prevention programme should be preventative and be set in motion before a crime is committed by focusing on the environment in which crimes are committed, rather than individual offenders. Furthermore, it should incorporate all disciplines dealing with human behaviour. Successfully implemented, this strategy will be more effective and certainly less expensive than punishment and retribution or even “target hardening” measures such as locks, alarms, and fences which affect users’ quality of life as much as those of criminals (Wenzel, 2007: 21).

There is growing interest within environmental criminology in the idea of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (hereafter CPTED, pronounced “sep-ted”), which is based on the premise that the ‘proper design and effective use of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the fear and incidence of crime, as well as an improvement in the quality of life” (Wenzel, 2007: 7). The built environment can be designed to minimise opportunity for crime without affecting the aesthetics of an area or making it difficult for legitimate users of an area to use it. The objective is to minimise opportunities for criminal activity.

The physical environment may play a role in instilling or preventing fear of crime in individuals. Neighbourhoods with high levels of noise, parties, graffiti, “dodgy” teenagers, drunks and tramps, rubbish and litter, boarded-up houses and run-down flats with broken windows are visual signs of neighbourhood and area decline. Such areas are often viewed as disorderly, unpredictable and threatening (see Baumer, 1985 & Taylor & Hale, 1986). Areas with high incivilities (decaying and deteriorating inner-city neighbourhoods) increase fear of victimisation, and provoke anxiety and apprehension amongst citizens (Box, Hale & Andrews, 1988). Also known as the “broken window” thesis, this perspective argues that neighbourhoods characterised by decay not only generate fear of crime among residents but send a signal...
to potential criminals that residents are unlikely to act in the event of criminal activity, making such activity less risky and crime more likely (Wilson & Kelling; in Schweitzer, Kim, & Mackin, 1999).

The evidence in this regard is inconclusive. Kanan and Pruitt (2002: 544), for example, conclude that emotional, investment, and social integration variables do not appear to substantially affect measures of fear and risk perception. Their results 'do not support the previously documented inverse relationship between various forms of investment in the neighborhood and fear levels. Neither individual home ownership nor length of residence is significant in these models.'

The role of the built environment in crime prevention has been fairly well researched by those who write from the perspective of CPTED. They argue that crime can be reduced or prevented through environmental design which influences decisions that precede criminal acts. Crime is lowest in areas with shared, visible public spaces where social cohesion is high (Jeffrey, 1971). There is a range of alternative strategies to create safer spaces and reduce fear of crime rather than creating walls (figuratively and literally); CPTED theorists seek to discover physical design principles that 'work' to reduce criminal activity and, with it, the fear of crime. (Spinks, 2001: 6).

The three key components of CPTED are natural surveillance, natural access control, and natural territorial reinforcement. Natural surveillance refers to maximising the visibility of a space so that all activities are observable by people engaged in normal day-to-day activities in an area. Natural access control aims to reduce criminal opportunity by denying people access to potential targets through appropriate entrances and exits, fencing, sufficient lighting, and landscaping features that control movement in and out of particular areas. Natural territorial reinforcement holds that the way in which an area is designed can increase people’s sense of ownership of that area. This may be achieved through signage, sufficient lighting, and landscaping which clearly demarcates public, semi-public, and private spaces (Wenzel, 2007: 6-7). Using lighting as an example, an area that is brightly illuminated may convey the perception of security for legitimate users but create apprehension of being detected among illegitimate users (Wenzel, 2007: 17).
CPTED scholars believe that constructing fortress-like environments is not an effective crime prevention strategy. Instead, they suggest that techniques for a safer environment should include proper lighting, defensible space (dividing areas into defensible zones), territoriality (one’s relationship to a particular space), and ‘surveillance’ to protect ‘defensible’ spaces. The underlying principle is that the higher the chances of being seen, the less likely criminals are to commit crime due to the anxiety of being observed (Gardner, 1995).

It was Jane Jacobs (1961) who first made reference to keeping ‘eyes on the street,’ a concept later developed as natural surveillance. Jacobs was critical of the urban renewal policies of the 1950s, which, she argued, destroyed thriving communities and created in their place isolated, unnatural urban spaces. Jacobs believed that neighbourhoods with diverse land use, such as residential, leisure, business, and administrative, were potentially safer than single use areas because there was a greater likelihood of a constant flow of people, both during the day and parts of the evening. This increased informal surveillance that was unlikely in single use areas. For example, residential areas were likely to be isolated during the day and commercial areas during the evenings.

In his study of New York, Oscar Newman used the term ‘defensible space’ to argue that spaces in which it was easier to be observed and from which it was difficult to escape are likely to deter potential criminals. High-rise buildings were dangerous because residents could not defend their territory due to the fact that they could not see others, feel a sense of ownership, or identify with the area in which they were

Figure 6: Home in Umbilo. Low / no wall and little vegetation makes it easy to see what is going on and it is also easy for the residents to keep a watch on the street and be aware of what is going on. Low WALLS, landscape and paving patterns make this a CPTED-friendly home.

Source: Author, 2013

Figure 7: Umbilo home that does not have walls or other signage. This home is very open, easily accessible to passers-by and provides natural surveillance which allows neighbours and passers-by to keep a check on what is going on.

Source: Author, 2013
Residents did not take personal responsibility because the area was occupied by so many people. The defensible space view should take into account the social aspect of crime prevention. The stronger the sense of community, the more likely it is that physical space will become important in preventing crime. It may matter less when residents do not trust one another. Variables such as the social and demographic characteristics of neighbourhoods also have to factored, into the equation (Schweitzer, Kim, & Mackin, 1999: 3).

This study interrogates the relationship between ways of constructing the built environment, fear of crime, and actual experiences of victimisation in the South African context.

**SUMMARY**

This chapter has examined the theoretical literature on the sources of fear of crime, social cohesion and principles of CPTED, and related them to the topic of this dissertation, namely, fear of crime. The literature review shows that there is a disjuncture between crime levels and fear of crime, as multiple factors impact on citizens’ perceptions of safety. These include their social, economic, health, crime, and other experiences. The factors affecting personal insecurity should therefore be examined in relation to one another and not separated and analysed in isolation. It follows that countries with low levels of social and communal protection will tend to have higher levels of feelings of unsafety. That there is often a mismatch between perception and actual occurrence of crime matters less than the fact that fear of crime leads to particular responses and shapes ordinary people’s behaviours in certain ways. It affects their levels of ‘tolerance, self-protective behaviour, security decisions, or institutional demands. In that sense, and considering the seriousness of many crimes, it can be said that fear is a bigger problem than crime itself’ (Torrente, 2002: 6). Many theorists argue that higher levels of social cohesion, together with the creation of defensible spaces, are the most efficacious way to reduce fear of crime.

Given the Ward 33 residents’ concerns about crime and their fear of crime, these theoretical insights are crucial to this study. This dissertation sets out to test the theoretical propositions outlined in this chapter through qualitative interviews which aimed to determine whether, in the first instance, people are fearful of crime and, if so, why this is the case. Is it based on personal experience, or media reports or police warnings, for example? On the other hand, what is it that results in some people not having a fear of crime? What are people’s ideas about social cohesion in this local community and does this impact on their fear of crime? Finally, what do they see as the solution – more security and higher walls or ‘eye on the streets – to reduce crime and the fear of crime? Answering these questions will help to understand how what is taking place in Ward 33 relates to the theoretical perspectives discussed in this chapter.

Chapter three outlines the methodology employed in this study, namely, intensive semi-structured interviews, which were subsequently analysed for common themes, patterns, and concerns in order to establish interviewees’ perceptions of their social worlds and to determine how this influenced their behaviour in that world.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study on crime and the fear of crime amongst residents of Ward 33 examines the ways in which they are seeking to make themselves feel safer in their own homes, with a particular focus on attitudes towards walls as a means of protection and security. This is examined in the context of scholarly work on crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED). As Patton (1990: 12) points out, the kind of data collected during research is determined by the ‘purpose of the research, the kind of information that is needed and the resources available to undertake research.’ The research design for this study is mixed, relying primarily on a range of qualitative methods, although some quantitative data is included. Qualitative data includes open-ended, in depth-interviews, and direct observation, as well as written documents (Patton, 1990: 10) which, together, allow a researcher to ‘gain insight into the field of enquiry through first hand and relayed experiences’ (Patton, 1990: 25).

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with residents and other key respondents such as police officers, the ward councillor, and security personnel to elicit information on the sources of crime and fear of crime, as well as examples of good practices that are effective in reducing crime and the fear of crime. The first point of contact with respondents was at a meeting of the Umbilo CPF. Here, I made contact with police officials as well as residents who are members of the CPF. I also looked at social media websites which provided me with the names of individuals who are also involved in local issues outside of the CPF. Advertisements by security companies in the local newspaper led me to interview security personnel. Related reports in the local community newspapers helped to identify persons of interest. I became aware of the work of Councillor Chapman through my supervisor. Finally, a few residents were sought out during the course of my photographic journey through the ward.

Additional sources of information include crime statistics from the SAPS and Crime Stats SA, spatial information (maps) obtained from the eThekweni Municipality, statistics on demographics from Census South Africa, direct observation and participation (fieldwork), and a perusal of mainly community newspapers and websites of relevant Non-governmental Organisations (NGOS) and other organisations active in Ward 33.

RESEARCH DESIGN: QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, PHOTOGRAPHS & STORYTELLING

The research design for this project is based predominantly on the use of photographs and narratives. Photographs are used to support the text as documentary evidence compiled during the research. The focus of this study is the various ways in which residents are marking-off their personal space through the use of walls, fences, or landscaping, or sometimes having no such physical boundaries at all, and whether these measures provide security or actually serve to create a divide between “insiders” and “outsiders”, and may even make people more vulnerable to crime because of their lack of visibility to outsiders. Walls were documented photographically and discussions were held with key informants about what the walls mean to them, and whether and how the walls (and other forms of boundary marking) contribute to “safety”.
I visited the ward on several occasions to photograph different types of walls and fences from a variety of angles. The homes of most of those who were interviewed were also photographed. Walls and fences are different from one another in terms of the material used to build them as well as the extent to which they demarcate areas. The Merriam Webster dictionary defines a fence as 'a barrier made of posts and wire or boards intended to prevent escape or intrusion or to mark a boundary,' while a wall is defined as 'a high thick masonry structure forming a long rampart or an enclosure chiefly for defense' (Merriam-Webster, 2013). The key distinction is that fences are made from overlying materials such as wooden posts or wire, whereas walls are continuous (and solid) barriers made from brick for fortification and defence purposes. One can see through fences because of the gaps and it is easier to break them down. Some homes have low walls that passers-by can easily see over. The concern of this study is not with these types of boundary markers (low walls), but with high walls that constitute both a physical barrier as well as a visual obstacle.

![Figure 8 & 9 - On the left is a house in Glenwood fortified with a high wall, while the photo on the right is that of a house with a low boundary wall. This kind of boundary marker (low wall or fence) means that the house is highly visible. Source: Author, 2013](image)

Photographs are a valuable research tool in visually illustrating the ways in which people use walls and fences, or no physical boundaries, to demarcate their places of residence. Where residents were agreeable, they were interviewed to tell the story behind the design of their homes (especially security measures), and their experiences of crime and fear of crime in order to establish whether there is a link between personal experiences and choice of security measures. Some residents were reluctant to allow their homes to be photographed because they felt that "exposing" themselves in this way may make them more vulnerable to crime. The photographs of physical boundaries around homes were used to elicit responses from non-owners / non-residents of those homes, such as police officers and security personnel to various forms of security adopted by residents in the ward.
Interest in visual culture promoted the use of photography in research, initially in anthropology, but subsequently in sociology, tourism studies, and geography. Images, which are an additional (re)source to text-based data (Ball and Smith, 2002), constitute an important part of the research process. They can be used in various ways in applied research and in this instance were used to stimulate conversation with participants about the security measures they have instituted, which they may have taken for granted and given little thought to, but which the photographs prompted them to reflect upon differently as they were also able to compare it with other homes. Photographs have the ability to ‘prod latent memory to stimulate and release emotional statements about the informant’s life’ (Collier, 1957: 858; in Harper, 2000: 3). They also ‘give interviews immediate character and help to keep them (respondents) focused’ (Schulze, 2007: 538).

Using photographs to stimulate or focus conversations during narrative interviews can lead to ‘a postmodern dialogue based on the authority of the subject rather than the researcher’ (Harper, 1998: 3). In this study, photographs were not used to get respondents, as storytellers, to actively participate in the research process by going out and making choices about the walls they wished to discuss. Instead, photographs taken by the researcher were used to illustrate the type, shape, and position of walls and fences in the neighbourhood in order to get respondents to look at walls differently from how they had always seen them, and also to get them to see what alternatives exist. Where subjects actively participate in the research process, by choosing the walls that are photographed, for example, follow-up interviews are known as photo-elicitation. Images do not have intrinsic meaning; participants provide meaning and rationale for the choices they make, producing data ‘that is more deeply grounded in the phenomenology of

Figure 10: Fortified wall in Glenwood. Electric fencing is visible to all, and passers-by are made aware of the internal security system through the ‘Chubb’ sign. Residents and others, however, have reasonable visibility on the upper levels as a result of the see-through palisade fencing.

Source: Author, 2013

Figure 11: This photo provides a good contrast. On the left is a house with high walls but one that has a degree of visibility because of the white see-through fencing, in direct contrast to the very high grey wall with no visibility.

Source: Author, 2013
the subject' (Schulze, 2007: 540). As noted, photographs are used differently in this study, as they were taken by the researcher rather than the participants, creating a possibility for bias in selection. However, the way in which they were used is akin to a “can-opener” in getting participants to engage in dialogue (Schulze, 2007: 537).

From the researcher’s perspective, photographs on their own may not have produced meaning because the various physical materials used, such as wood, metal, plastics, and paint, contribute to the final product (wall or fence), while passers-by, homeowners, visitors, and would-be thieves interact and react with the actual physical walls and fences. Working from visual records would not have made this graphic and a visit to the research site was invaluable in understanding the various dimensions involved in walls and fences. Visiting respondents at their homes, which was an opportunity to experience the home from within and also enabled the researcher to take the location and context of the home into account, was a valuable means to understand and appreciate the non-visual aspects of the walls and fences and their impact on residents (Dicks, Soyinka, and Coffey, 2006: 79).

Social researchers do not agree on whether images should be considered data or merely ways of storing information. While one view is that the ‘static recorded image itself cannot say very much,’ others believe that images ‘can be an important part of a critical methodology in providing material representations that allow both researchers and participants to reflect, and in doing so, co-construct knowledge in a particular
way’ (Murray, 2009: 473). I am inclined to the latter view, notwithstanding the restrictions and biases in how premises were photographed.

Context, narrative, and reflexivity matter in image-based research. Context is important because images and the symbols within them ‘mean different things to different people at different times.’ Researchers must therefore reflect on each selection and argue cogently for their inclusion. Images have an internal and external narrative. The internal narrative is the “story” of the image as seen by the viewer (which may differ from what the researcher wanted to convey), while the external narrative is the context in which the image is produced and viewed (Mason, 2005: 332-334). Murray refers to this as the sites of production and ‘audiencing’ of the image. As images are representations rather than reflections, explanation is needed to broaden the context (reflexivity) and to make sense of them through written material (2009: 472).

According to Emmison and Smith (2000), researchers incorrectly tend to view the visual as either still or moving camera images and treat it as ‘data’ itself, under-valuing it in comparison to written records. They argue:

*Photographs have been misunderstood as constituting forms of data in their own right when in fact they should be considered in the first instance as means of preserving, storing or representing information. In this sense photographs should be seen as analogous to code-sheets, the responses to interview schedules, ethnographic fieldnotes, tape recordings of verbal interaction or any one of the numerous ways in which the social researchers seek to capture data for subsequent analysis* (Emmison & Smith, 2000: 2; in Dicks, Soyinka, & Coffey, 2006: 79)

Emmison and Smith clarify that, photographs are not ‘what the camera can record but what the eye can see’ (Emmison and Smith, 2000: 4 in Dicks, Soyinka, and Coffey, 2006: 79); that is, the way in which photographs are taken and interpreted is subjective. Interviewing respondents thus proved important to allow me to solicit the perspectives of residents of their walls and fences, which may have otherwise proven different from that which I, as viewer of the photograph of a fence / non-fence may have had.

The use of images in research is not unproblematic. According to Mason (2005: 329) image-based research can be subjective because judgments are made about what is selected and the interpretations derived there from, while the resulting narratives, based upon this selection, may produce inclusions and exclusions (Murray, 2009: 472). In this research, for example, the way in which a photograph is framed or the angle at which it is shot can influence how one perceives a particular wall or fence. The following is an example of this. In the photograph on the left the wall does not look very menacing; yet by cropping the photograph in particular ways, the same wall looks higher and appears to provide considerably more privacy.
This research was restricted in part by the fact that several of the informants, for various reasons, wished to remain anonymous. One reason is that they felt that coming into the “public eye” would increase the likelihood of them coming into the radar of would-be criminal elements in the future. This meant that it was not possible to always link narratives to specific homes, walls and fences to capture the full meaning of what these boundary markers mean to residents.

RESEARCH FOR THIS PROJECT

Research for this project began with a drive through the study area on a Friday afternoon in late March 2012 with my supervisor, Professor Monique Marks. The purpose of this “field trip” was to get a sense of the area and identify certain walls / fences as well as houses without any obvious security devices that would be of interest for this study. While this was a preliminary visit, certain features of specific boundary walls caught our eye, such as homes with no fencing in a supposedly “dangerous” area or others with very obvious electric fencing. Subsequent to this, I visited the ward with documentary photographer, Cedric Nunn in mid-May 2012, to whom I was introduced by my supervisor. Mr Nunn and I walked through various streets in the ward, discussing the boundaries around the properties that Professor Marks and I had identified, as well as others that caught Mr Nunn’s attention, who also spoke informally about the possible ways in which those walls could be photographed for different purposes. Being accompanied by two experienced researchers during these visits allowed me to understand firsthand how they approached the subject matter, and was invaluable when I subsequently identified homes / walls / fences for this project.

In examining the walls, fences and other boundary markers photographed, a few things should be noted. The typical 'high wall' that this study refers to is one constructed from brick, ranging in height to up to about two metres, probably having an electric fence or broken glass or razor wire on top. Such walls run around the property, with the only breaks being a gate / garage to allow vehicle access and an entrance to allow pedestrian access. Gates that allow vehicle access usually, though not always, present a visual barrier. Warning signs on walls and gates include the word “DANGER” (“GEVAAR” in Afrikaans and “INGOZI” in Xhosa).
The use of mainly qualitative research methods as opposed to quantitative (survey) methods was deemed the most appropriate way to probe the key questions central to this study. Qualitative research means different things to different people but in its most general sense it is:

_a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible..... Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials – case study; personal experience; introspection; life story; interview; artefacts; cultural texts and productions; observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts – that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008: 4-5)._ 

In research on fear of crime, qualitative techniques were originally employed by feminist researchers in the 1970s who felt that quantitative surveys failed to take adequate account of experiences such as sexual harassment and domestic violence. There are some things that qualitative research can, arguably, do better than quantitative methodologies. Qualitative researchers can get closer to an individual’s point of view through ethnography and interviews; they may be able to better appreciate the constraints on the everyday lives of their subjects because their research focuses on specific cases; and they are able to produce valuable “rich” or “thick” descriptions of the social world (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008: 17).
Storytelling forms an important part of the research process. The means by which informants convert their experience into words, or ‘narrative’, are a vital part of the research process if used ‘carefully’ and with ‘reflection’ (Koch, 1998: 1184). Narratives allow the researcher to gain a deeper understanding of a situation, while at the same time carefully situating stories and restoring them chronologically. However, qualitative surveys may be problematic because the process is not a neutral one; researchers wield power over the process by interrupting informants through asking questions when informants are speaking and sometimes even editing the recorded transcript to support their own arguments (Abrams, 2010: 129). At the same time, respondents also have the power to choose whether they want to be interviewed, what they say, and what information they hold back.

The purpose of this study is not necessarily to generalise the findings to all residents of the ward and the sampling is therefore not representative. Initial contact with potential respondents, including police officials and security personnel, was made at a local CPF meeting, while other interviewees were recommended by word of mouth, and the names of a few respondents were obtained as a result of their active role in the community which resulted in them being reported in the local media, such as the Berea Mail. The respondents include members of the CPF, police officers, a local councillor, representatives from security companies, and ordinary residents who were willing to take part in this study. They are not, however, fully representative in terms of the demographics of the area.

Aside from the reluctance of some residents to participate in the project, no major methodological problems were experienced. Those who participated in the project appeared comfortable with the formal semi-structured interviews and with being recorded, and were happy to be quoted. In fact, one of the reasons for recording the interviews was to produce direct quotes from the interviewees in order to bring their “voices” directly into this dissertation. There is a danger of quotes being used to perpetuate stereotypes or even to misrepresent interviewees by isolating certain of their sayings and quoting these out of context. This is referred to as ‘quote mining’ (Morris, 1994: 106). A conscious attempt is made throughout this dissertation to avoid this practice, advertently or inadvertently, by ensuring that the quotes reflect what the respondents intended to mean.

With so many South Africans affected by crime it is not surprising that the interviews yielded a vast amount of material and one of the biggest challenges in writing this dissertation was to limit the inclusion of material to that which was germane to its aims and objectives.

The discourse (language) used by residents and police officers, and their interpretation of events and assumptions about crime, sometimes differed from that of the researcher. This helped to shape the analysis as it meant critically interrogating the testimonies with regard to such issues as their association of race with crime. One of the challenges in the writing process was not simply to “report” what was said in a journalistic fashion but to provide a critical dimension to their views, and to see how those fit into the general narrative. The ability to do this without offending the interviewees was tricky for one learning this craft.
There is an assumption in the research process that interviewer and interviewee have shared understandings of the questions asked and responses given, which is not necessarily the case. Another assumption is that interviewees will provide an honest assessment of their feelings, which may also not be the case. As Gadd and Jefferson point out (2007: 132),

... subjects are not rationally unitary beings with full self-knowledge, but psychosocial subjects with a split consciousness, constantly unconsciously defending themselves against anxiety. This affects what and how anything is remembered, with painful or threatening events being either forgotten or recalled in a safely modified fashion; it also affects how such memories are communicated to any interviewer, given that the context of the interview may be more or less threatening. At both stages, the act of remembering and the act of communication, meaning is rarely straightforward – and never wholly transparent. The interviewer too is a defended subject, and so the same applies; the meanings – of the questions asked and how answers are understood – will also be affected by the interviewer's dynamic unconscious with its own ‘logic’ of defensive investments.

One of the implications of this version of subjectivity is the importance of trying to understand a person's whole biography in order to make sense of the part that is remembered. Gadd and Jefferson (2007: 133-134) advocate getting people to tell their life stories, such as details they remember, conclusions they draw about their past, and so on. In follow-up interviews, the interviewee can be asked to think and talk more deeply about key themes. They also advise that interviewers should avoid ‘why’ questions so that people ‘reveal stories and avoid the premature closure, and intellectualizations, which explanations tend to promote’ as well as ‘clumsy intrusions’.

In reading the transcripts it is evident that on occasion my interruption interrupted the flow of what the informant was saying, and I do wish that I could have gone back to probe some of the testimony in the way that Gadd and Jefferson suggest. However, this was not always possible. It is also evident that interviews conducted later in the research cycle are more detailed and contain more relevant information, probably because I was more aware of the area, the problems, and the kinds of questions that needed to be asked.

Understanding the relationship between the photographs, people’s narrations, and the wider issues requires familiarity with the context and here, background research was important. This included site visits by foot and car to get a “feel” of area. As photographers demonstrate, not everything that gives meaning to a photograph is visual. Visiting homes provided a more realistic picture of what it is like “on the ground”. In addition to interviews and photographs, this study draws on a range of sources such as census data to compile a demographic profile of the study area and crime statistics to establish levels of crime in the area, the types of crime that are most common in the area, changes in levels of crime over the past five years, and other such pertinent information.
Where relevant, a comparison is made with other areas in the region to establish whether these crime levels are abnormally high or on par with other suburbs. The documentation covered a wide spectrum, ranging from council documents and policies to documentation on the establishment and management of the area by residents and other stakeholders. These include minutes of meetings, community newsletters, letters to the council, annual reports, and information from websites. Newspapers proved an important source of information to corroborate or contradict some of the issues raised in the interviews and thus make the process more rigorous.

VALIDITY & RELIABILITY

A narrative approach is used in this dissertation, both via photographs and through story telling. This can be problematic because of power inequities: who initiates the research, who formulates the key questions, how the data is collected, and how it is used and made public. This can affect its validity and objectivity. Much has been written on objectivity and we will not go into the debate here. Suffice to say that this study agrees with position of Guba and Lincoln (2008: 275) that objectivity ‘is a chimera; a mythological creature that never existed, save in the imagination of those who believe that knowing can be separated from the knower.’ As Denzin and Lincoln (2008: 28) point out, the personal biography of the researcher intervenes in the research process, including the interpretation of data. The researcher’s class, racial, gender, cultural, and linguistic background influences his / her perspective. They write that:

*the gendered, multiculturally situated researcher approaches the world with a set of ideas, a framework (theory, ontology) that specifies a set of questions (epistemology) that he or she then examines in specific ways (methodology, analysis)…. Every interpreter writes from within a distinct interpretive community that configures, in its special way, the multicultural, gendered components of the research act…. This perspective leads the researcher to adopt particular views of the “Other” who is studied.*

At the same time the power and agency of the interviewee should not be discounted. Respondents do have power to choose whether or not to participate in the research as well as what they choose to tell or not to tell. They may also use the research to further their own agendas.

Once the data were collected and analysed, it was my task to interpret the material. Qualitative interpretations are constructed by the researcher who produces the public text. This interpretive practice is both ‘artistic and political’ as there is no single interpretive truth but ‘multiple interpretive communities’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008: 35). In simple terms, this means that the testimonies of interviewees can be used selectively to create a certain narrative, rather than provide a balanced perspective.

While reliability and validity are more commonly associated with quantitative research, they also have a place in the qualitative research paradigm. In quantitative research, the emphasis is on the causes of behaviour using information in the form of numbers that can be quantified and summarised. The mathematical process is the norm for analysing numeric data and the final result is expressed in statistical
terminologies (Golafshani, 2003: 598). Reliability in quantitative research refers to the extent to which results are consistent over time and can be replicated or repeated, while validity determines whether the research measures what it was intended to measure and how accurate or truthful the results are. There can be no reliability without validity (Golafshani, 2003: 599-601).

The aim of quantitative research is to infer from a sample to a larger population. Qualitative research, on the other hand, refers to research that produces results that are not arrived at by means of quantification. It is interpretive and context-dependent, inductive, and seeks to understand particulars rather than inferring to universals. Qualitative researchers ‘seek illumination, understanding, and extrapolation to similar situations’ (Golafshani, 2003: 601). Nonetheless, qualitative research has to convince readers that it is worth paying attention to. Since reliability involves measurements, there is a view that it has no place in qualitative research, as there is no reality external to our perception of it and we therefore cannot concern ourselves with the ‘truth’ or ‘falsity’ of an observation, which is a primary concern of validity (Trochim & Donnelly, 2006).

Most researchers accept that their research has to be reliable and valid. The problem is how to judge this when qualitative studies do not use formalised sampling methods; there is no mechanism for estimating the true score; and the operational procedures used to assess validity and reliability in quantitative research have no corresponding operations for qualitative research (Trochim, 2006). Alternatives to traditional criteria have been proposed. In place of internal validity, proponents of qualitative research speak of credibility; transferability instead of external validity; dependability instead of reliability; and confirmability instead of objectivity (Golafshani, 2003: 600-602).

For ‘validity’, terms like ‘rigour’, ‘trustworthy’, and ‘quality’ have been coined as ways to avoid bias and increase the ‘truthfulness’ of the research. Validity is different from objectivity in that while a strong argument can be made that objectivity can never be achieved, Guba and Lincoln (2008: 37) state that validity can be determined by answering the following questions: ‘Are these findings sufficiently authentic (isomorphic to some reality, trustworthy, related to the way others construct their social worlds) that I may trust myself in acting on their implications? More to the point, would I feel sufficiently secure about these findings to construct social policy or legislation based on them?’

There is no final answer but we can use several criteria. There are various kinds of validity viz. descriptive (accurate description); interpretive (seeing things from the perspective of subjects); theoretical (explaining data succinctly); and external (generalisability). The latter refers to the ‘fit’ between the area studied and another area that one is interested in. In such situations, ‘thick descriptions’ of both areas are important to establish similarities and differences. Triangulation, that is, the use of multiple methods of gathering data, is advocated as a way to enhance reliability and validity. This includes interviews, recordings, photographs, and observations to produce a more ‘valid, reliable and diverse construction of realities.’ This can be augmented by using the interpretations of other researchers studying the research participants (Golafshani, 2003: 604). Another suggestion is to standardise data collection techniques and protocols across several
sites and document the research process in detail. Field notes, which include personal reflections, observations, and emerging theories, are also important (Trochim, 2006).

Guba and Lincoln (2008: 274-275) point to several criteria of “valid” inquiry: fairness, ontological authenticity, educative authenticity, catalytic authenticity, and tactical authenticity. By fairness, they are referring to balance, that is, all stakeholder views, concerns, and perspectives are represented. Ontological and educative authenticity refers to the raised level of awareness by individual research participants and by individuals with whom they come into contact. Catalytic and tactical authenticity refer to the ability of research to prompt action on the part of research participants, and the ability of the researcher to provide training in particular forms of social and political action.

This chapter focused on the theoretical aspects of the research process. In discussing these important aspects of qualitative research, the pleasure and enjoyment that is often derived from this experience is omitted. Interviews can be done by telephone or even by e-mail but there is no substitute for the intimacy of face-to-face discussions. Hand gestures, expressions, facial gestures, and the interview setting were important during the conversations. Upon meeting, researcher and respondent are compelled to make general conversation to “break the ice”, get to know each other and develop a degree of trust on which the success of the interview depends and which may not be possible over the telephone.

This research process was long and tiring and there were tense moments and close shaves because I am petrified of dogs. Most homes had dogs and looking for protection behind my hosts wasn’t much pleasure. But I had a lot of fun and found this research personally enriching, as I was able to share the life experiences and deep inner thoughts of people from all walks of life. Most of them are much older than I am and this alone was an education for me.

Chapters four to six focus on some of the key findings of this study, beginning, in chapter four, with a discussion of the factors that produce fear of crime among some residents in Ward 33.
CHAPTER FOUR: SOURCES OF FEAR OF CRIME

Crime is the subject, the topic – people are always discussing, like the weather. You’ll always find if you go anywhere – that’s why I get bored going to barbecues at times – somebody’s got a story to tell about crime, how somebody broke in and, you know, – the weather people will talk about the weather, you say it’s cold today. Yes, we all know it’s cold because we feeling cold or – so it can be boring mundane subjects like, really, I don’t want to go to a barbecue and everybody’s just discussing crime, you know, let’s rather talk about philosophy or, or the latest movie on the circuit but crime is, is, crime is such a big topic…. 

- Susan

As Susan’s sentiments suggest, some residents in the ward are consumed by fear of crime to the point that it is an everyday topic of conversation. Most respondents expressed some level of fear of crime. The source and extent of that fear varied, due to both objective and subjective factors, and did not necessarily correlate with actual crime statistics. This chapter examines the multiple sources of fear of crime, which include more rapid and easily accessible information about crime, actual victimisation, urban decay, political and demographic change, and the presence of foreign nationals and refugees in the ward.

There are two broad categories of sources of fear of crime, one being the physical and social environment and the other the kind of information shared within communities. Studies show that reported or perceived higher crime rates can increase anxiety about actual victimisation. As discussed in chapter two, Hall et al. (1978), Cohen (2002), and Gadd & Jefferson (2007) refer to this phenomenon as ‘moral panic’. Other respondents are fearful because they have been victims of crime. Family or close friends’ experiences of crime or individuals’ personalities may also induce fear of crime. Some respondents are more fearful than others under similar circumstances. There is thus no “one size fits all” explanation for fear of crime among respondents.

Some crime-related anxiety is related to what respondents perceive as ‘undesirable’ changes in demographics and incivilities in the ward as a consequence of the broader political, economic, and social changes in South Africa over the past two decades. Residents’ fears may thus reflect displaced anxieties about macro changes. While respondents framed the perceived link between demographic change and crime carefully so as not to appear racist, underlying most narratives is a moral panic around desegregation and a demographic stereotyping of crime. One of the reasons for selecting Ward 33 as the site of study is the degree of race and class diversification that has taken place in recent years. The brief profiles of respondents at the beginning of this thesis point to some of the differences (mainly education, income, and gender) among respondents who are located in different parts of the ward, as reflected in the map below.
Figure 18: Street Map of Ward 33, Durban: Showing location of key informants

Source: eThekwini Municipality, 2013 (adapted by author)
Location is important in contextualising respondents’ experiences and perceptions given the visible differences of class, race, “urban decay”, and demographics within the ward. According to Captain Patrick of the Umbilo SAPS, traditionally, working class whites who were employed by the railways or worked at the harbour lived in Umbilo in the southern part of Ward 33. In the post-apartheid period, (white) residents who could afford it began moving northwards. ‘For example,’ Captain Patrick points out, ‘somebody who stayed at the bottom of Sydney Road could now afford a house on the top of Manning Road. So the house at the bottom was no longer good enough for a white person, so a non-white person then moved in.’ While this may be the case, it should be noted that many whites still live in Umbilo.

One of the concerns of this study is to determine whether these differences have a bearing on attitudes towards crime and fear of crime.

**THE IMPACT OF SECONDARY INFORMATION ON FEAR OF CRIME**

Secondary information about crime, from newsletters, newspaper reports, television news programmes, gossip, rumours, Facebook and twitter, and Community Policing Forums (CPF)s, is one source of fear of crime. These formal and informal local networks are sites where potential threats are discussed and used by residents to assess the crime threat in the neighbourhood. Michael, who lives in Glenmore, said that his anxiety about crime in the neighbourhood is heightened by news reports about crime. As he puts it,

*especially in the Blue Security news, the newsletter, you see, then that frightens you. We have it emailed to us. It covers virtually the whole of Durban. What you read a lot of is driveway gates derailed. They lift them off. You need to have devices on the gate to stop it being lifted.*

Appendix A is an example of news about crime disseminated by Blue Security.

Community tabloids also provide a regular diet of information about crime. For example, Amy relies on:

*papers like the Glenwood Gazette. They will talk about maybe an Umbilo Park or some building that’s just lying there empty for years and then vagrants go in there and sleep. That we read in the paper. Also, criminals come from Cato Manor at the back here, Mayville, there are shacks there. And I read about Albert Park, all these people [criminals] come from there.*

Tabloids are often filled with sensational crime and murder stories. Appendix B is an example of a tabloid whose coverage of crime issues is heightening awareness of crime as well as fear of victimisation. As chapter two showed, the reporting of “shock events” and disproportionate coverage of crime may lead people to believe that levels of crime are higher than they actually are, contributing to a “moral panic” around crime. Hall et al. (1978: 57) speak of the ‘social production’ of news in which the media ‘define for the majority of the population what significant events are taking place’ and ‘offer powerful interpretations of how to understand these events.’ This includes defining who is involved in these events.
Warrant Office (W/O) Percy of the Umbilo SAPS emphasised the role of social media in fostering fear of crime among ordinary people:

You get robbed now, you post it on a social network and everybody hears about it. [Before], if something happens to someone else it never affects you. Now social networks are bringing it to you. Say, unfortunately, you are coming out of varsity, someone snatches your phone. You pass it on via email. Somebody else starts to now relate to you, it’s like a trigger. Something small happens to you and you scream, “eina, I have had enough. I know this guy; I know it’s happened to that person”...

Residents also follow crime trends on Facebook (See Appendix C for an example). Speaking about hijacking, for example, Sarah, who lives in Glenwood in close proximity to the Woolworths store in Bulwer Road, pointed out:

If you go on Facebook you will have a hijacking a day in most areas and when we went to our [CPF] meeting they said that hijacking is on the increase. We are more worried about crime because we have become more aware of it. You pick up Facebook you hear it. Before you never used to hear what was happening down the road unless you bumped into someone … but now it’s there, it’s also in our local newspapers; it’s on the news, so you are aware of it.

Community Policing Forums (CPF) are an important source of information about crime. At a CPF meeting on 4 October 2012, for example, Colonel Mkhize conceded that Ward 33 was a “hotspot” of crime and explained some of the major crime trends in the area. Naomi and Sarah are part of the Umbilo CPF.

According to Naomi:

I don’t know whether it’s because we are part of the CPF that we are more aware [of crime] because people living further up don’t seem to worry because they don’t attend our CPF meetings….. With the police now having their monthly meetings, they are giving us trends, either things are up or down, so that we can see what is happening and when the community can see what is happening, maybe they will take more interest.
Speakers at CPF meetings usually reinforce the feeling of being under siege from criminals. For example, on 12 November 2012, guest speaker Brad, a private investigator by profession, told the audience that crime is
completely out of control [in the ward]. And it’s not going to get better. Our unemployment rate continues to rise. People continue to breed…. So we need to protect ourselves and the people close to us in our own community, our own families, and start taking our own action for our protection, we can’t rely on the police force entirely…. You have got to make sure that you can protect yourselves and you can protect people around you.

The audience was urged to take such measures as installing security gates, alarm systems and outside beams ‘because as soon as the guy triggers the outside beams, he knows that the time on the clock is now shortened because the armed response company is on its way.’

At a follow-up Ward 33 Area 1 CPF meeting, Brad again emphasised that with the police under-resourced, ‘men need to protect their families.’ He emphasised the narrative of the male as protector on several occasions. Brad also drew inspiration in the struggle to root out crime in the local community from an iconic figure. He said that when US-based television personality Oprah Winfrey visited South Africa, where she opened a school in the township of Soweto in Gauteng, he [Brad] was one of her bodyguards and asked her about the fight against crime in her home city of Chicago. She advised him that ‘when small crime is dealt with, the big crime falls away’ (Berea News, 22 March 2013: 4). Brad urged residents to act in unison against crime in the neighbourhood and went on to say that if each local community did likewise it would help to reduce the national crime problem.

Members of the audience probably left the meeting more anxious about crime than ever, as Brad provided detailed instructions on what to do in the event of an attempted hijacking or rape which were on the increase in the neighbourhood. His message was categorical, ‘We can’t rely on the police force’ due to its lack of resources, poor training, and inadequate personnel. Many of those present complained that the South African constitution affords more protection to the human rights of criminals than it does to those of victims. Perceptions of “soft” law and order can exacerbate fear of crime and cause ordinary people to unite around shared anxieties in order to take responsibility for their security (Box, Hale & Andrews, 1988: 340).

The constant stream of information about crime may be creating an exaggerated perception and may contribute to a widening gap between residents’ experiences and fears. People become paranoid, thinking that it is only a matter of time before they too will be victims. As one respondent put it, ‘the meat is rawer than ever,’ suggesting that crime reporting is more graphic and sensational. Some academic studies support the notion that information increases fear. One study in the US, for example, found that the public persists in believing that violent crime is a national problem even though crime trends are declining. This supports cultivation theory’s prediction that exposure to violent programming on prime-time television leads to increased fear of and concern about crime (Romer, Jamieson, Hall & Aday, 2003: 88).
W/O Percy identified the suburb of Umbilo as contributing to crime in Ward 33 (See Appendix D for a profile of the area covered by the Umbilo SAPS). Criminals have easy access in and out of the ward because of 'the [southern] freeway, Umbilo Road, Sydney Road, as well the western freeway runs past.' Criminals from Cato Crest, Mayville, Cato Manor, Kwa Mashu, and even Umlazi use these routes to move in and out of the precinct. 'Basically what they do,' he explained, 'is they come into the areas, they steal and go back into their areas.'

The many industries, schools, and hospitals in Ward 33 increase 'the influx of people, we are looking at a massive influx per day. I think 80 percent of the population from our schools is from outside the area.' Hospitals are another magnet that attracts people. According to Percy, patients and visitors come from as far afield as Nkandla, Stanger, and Verulam to the provincial King Edward VIII Hospital in Umbilo. There isn't enough secure parking and many visitors 'don't know the area, they park outside, they go for treatment and come back, the car is gone. The sad part is that the poorest of the poor gets affected.' St. Augustine's hospital in Glenwood faces 'exactly the same situation. If you go there at any given time, there are about 400 to 500 cars parked outside and it triples when you have got visiting hours.'

The police regard hospitals as a “hotspot” for crime, especially motor vehicle related crimes. It is no wonder that residents of Glenwood are up in arms about a new hospital being built on JB Marks (formerly Chelmsford) Road. Gary Walker, who lives in Glenwood, said that residents were concerned that the already 'critical' traffic situation would become chaotic (Berea News, 10 May 2013: 3).

W/O Percy regards the Davenport Centre in Glenwood as another cause of increasing crime because it is surrounded by financial institutions which attract clients who once went to the Durban CBD:

*At one stage, the CBD was where all the banking institutions used to be. It's no more now. So if you look at Davenport Centre, you have got Standard Bank, First National, and Nedbank with a shopping centre - everybody is coming to do their banking, shopping and everything in that small vicinity where there is no parking.*
These factors have long been seen as contributing to the high rates of crime in the area. A 1995 report, for example, concluded that Umbilo was the ‘most unsafe’ area in Durban. The then commander of the Umbilo SAPS, Major Roos, said that the size of the patrol area and the large number of people passing through on a daily basis were responsible for the high crime rate. The Dalton Hostel, King Edward VIII Hospital, factories, and shopping complexes were ‘natural drawcards’ for crime. Even then estate agents complained that they were affected by the area’s ‘stigmatisation’ (Daily News, 16 March 1995).

This view, it appears, has not changed.

Appendix E provides a comparison between crime in Umbilo and Umlazi. Umlazi was chosen because during the apartheid era it was a township established to the south of Durban primarily for Africans and in the post-apartheid period it remains a predominantly African township. While crime rates are substantially higher in Umlazi with regard to murder, attempted murder, and illegal possession of firearms, the reverse is true in the case of burglary at non-residential premises, burglary at residential premises, theft of motor vehicles, theft out of or from motor vehicles, driving under the influence of alcohol, shoplifting, and carjacking, lending credence to the police argument that passing traffic contributes to higher rates of crime in Umbilo, which is part of Ward 33.

According to Captain Patrick, different kinds of crime are committed in different parts of the ward. The most crime ridden areas are the hostel and public transport hubs in Umbilo, such as taxi ranks, and thoroughfares through Umbilo Park. The captain added that in the southern part of the ward there are robberies (stealing your wallet, for example), assault with gross bodily harm such as stabbing, and fighting (including domestic related incidents), while the northern part of the ward is witness to attempted hijackings, house break-ins, and armed robbery. There is a racial difference in victimisation, with most victims in the Umbilo area being people of colour.

**ACTUAL VICTIMISATION AND ITS IMPACT ON FEAR OF CRIME**

The impact of actual victimisation on the behaviour of respondents is not consistent. Susan has been a victim of crime in the Glenwood / Umbilo area three times since 2006. On the first occasion she was walking along Umbilo Road when she was confronted by ‘two little delinquents,’ one of whom ‘pulled out a long curved knife’, and asked for her bag. She was carrying a self-defence spray and ‘got them full-on and they literally ran into each other and then an African gentleman came over and said, “how, you very cheeky, madam, show me that stuff, I want to get some for my wife”.’ On the second occasion she was at Davenport Centre where she had just withdrawn cash from an ATM. Suddenly, ‘they pulled my bag and I pulled it and they pulled it and eventually, years ago I did karate and I had my blocks. By then everybody had come out – security guards, maids, people in the road.’ Her assailants took off without the bag. She was less fortunate at Umbilo Park in 2010. She was carrying a bag full of lingerie which she was hawking and groceries that she had just bought. She was attacked by three men who ‘took everything. After the
attack I was really scared.’ Fortunately, a police vehicle was passing by and took Susan to the nearby church.

According to Susan, these incidents have not affected her day-to-day behaviour. She does not possess a car and, as a working class woman, has no choice but to move around the neighbourhood by bus or foot to get to work, visit friends, and do her shopping and other chores. Gated communities and walled homes are beyond her means, not that she expressed any inclination for this form of security.

Mary has also been a victim of crime. In June 2012, five men broke into her Glenwood home, ‘smashed the doors down and grabbed everything, my laptop, but they were chased by the neighbourhood watch.’ As discussed in the next chapter, victimisation increased Mary’s fear of crime and she has been proactive in taking steps to reduce the likelihood of being a victim in the future.

Amy is very anxious about crime. Her fear stems from several experiences of victimisation. On the first occasion, someone jumped over the wall at around ‘half past four in the morning. The neighbours screamed because one guy had his head into their window and one guy was in our yard. So my husband and the boys went out. They jumped the wall and they ran. One got caught.’ On another occasion, someone jumped over the wall and stole her gas cylinder. On the third occasion, when she returned from dropping her son off at school, she ‘parked my car, closed the garage and I am coming out towards the [front] door and the gate’ when a man tried to get into her yard. ‘I saw this guy and said, "let me just close the door". As long as the gate was locked I was happy. I banged the door in his face.’ She was left trembling. Adding to her fears was an incident involving her son while he was walking home from the University of KwaZulu-Natal. Close to Pigeon Valley, ‘it’s very bushy and this guy comes out and grabbed him and wanted the cell [phone] and even hurt him. But we read that there was another one or two incidents.’ As discussed in the next chapter, in response to these incidents Ms S.K. has taken various physical measures to protect her home.

Ashley has not been a victim of crime but has witnessed several incidents close to her home. On one occasion, the ‘neighbour across the road was hijacked one morning, here, outside his house. They took his car, they left him. He has got very paranoid [after that].’ A more harrowing experience was when she heard a sound around

three o’clock in the morning and I got up to have a look out of the window. I said to my sister, what’s happened over there? It looks like a black bag lying in the middle of the road. I saw an African man cross the road, went back to his house, and I saw a police van come and I, being nosy, watched and I said to her, it’s not a black bag, it’s a body lying in the road and eventually the mortuary van came and took him away.

She subsequently learnt that this murder was committed by the “axe murderer”, Joseph Ntshongwane who was arrested for three charges of murder, one of attempted murder, and one of assault with intent to do
grievous bodily harm. His victims’ bodies were found in March 2011 in Montclair, Lamontville, and Umbilo.\(^2\)

Ashley is adamant, however, that these incidents have not altered her behaviour in any significant way nor has she taken special security measures.

As noted in chapter two, victimisation or being exposed to criminal activity can influence levels of fear of crime. For example, Tseloni and Zarafonitou (2008: 387) found that in Greece, ‘indirect and direct prior victimization and crime exposure predominantly shape[d] perceived future risk’. In Ward 33, respondents are reacting differently to such experiences. As chapter five shows, some have taken pre-emptive measures while others have not. Susan and Ashley, for example, have not taken any special measures aside from ‘using common sense’ and ‘being careful’. It is not coincidental that both women live in the Umbilo part of the ward, which is less well-off economically; this may limit their choices.

Another theme that emerged in these narratives is race. Susan spoke of the ‘African gentleman’ and ‘Indian lady’. Two decades into post-apartheid South Africa, race remains a point of reference for many people. The reaction of the ‘African gentleman’ in wanting a self-defence spray for his wife suggests that South Africans of all backgrounds are affected by crime. Yet there is strong racial stereotyping of crime. Sarah’s comments about a possible criminal incident demonstrate the way in which stereotypes are formed about perpetrators of crime. She lives in a secure block of duplexes in Glenwood. One morning in early 2011, she was upstairs cleaning her cupboards when she heard her dog bark but did not take notice. When she came down for a cup of coffee, ‘as I took my kettle, this white guy had walked in. We looked at each other…. I got such a fright I couldn’t scream, and he got such a fright that he ran. To this day I can still see his face.’ She called the police who arrived 25 minutes later. ‘But I thought,’ Sarah said, ‘you know what, people on that side would have thought that it was a visitor - there was this white guy casually strolling and you know he didn’t look like a baddy.’ The subtle undertone in Sarah’s narrative is that the individual’s “race” made it easier to enter the property as he was less likely to be considered a criminal threat.

On the other hand, Mary’s experience of crime has caused her to associate criminal activity with blackness. Aside from the robbery at home, her office at her present place of employment has been broken into; five years ago she was ‘attacked by a group of four or five young black men, they came with screwdrivers;’ and on another occasion, at the beachfront, ‘they grabbed my bag, a group of young black men.’ The result is that

\[I \text{ can't deny that when I walk outside, when there is lots of young black men, not young black people, I worry [because] I have this situation with young black men. There is a demographic, unfortunately, and this is the huge tragedy of it and it’s unwarranted but psychologically you can't make me feel easier when a group of young black men come towards me. I am threatened. I mean it's not a group of young} \]

---

\(^2\) Joseph Ntshongwana, now known as “The Axe Man”, who played rugby for the Blue Bulls franchise between 1998 and 2001, claimed that he killed to avenge the gang-rape and subsequent HIV-infection of his daughter. Police investigations revealed that no such rape occurred. Ntshongwana was violent and spoke in “tongues” at his arraignment. At a mental competency hearing in January 2012, Ntshongwana’s family claimed that he was mentally ill, suffering from shizoaffective disorder. However, a psychiatrist testified that Ntshongwana was not mentally unstable and that the murders were premeditated. In February 2012, a court in Durban declared him fit to stand trial. Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_Ntshongwana
white men that did this to me. Or a group of young Indian men. I don’t feel threatened by them. And that is why I am saying, subconsciously when a group of young [black] men approach me, they are not going to [do anything] but I just suddenly feel, uh!

The theme of race and crime is explored later in this chapter.

Some of the residents’ fears are related to rapid demographic changes in Ward 33 over the past two decades which they associate with increased crime.

**URBAN DECAY AND FEAR OF CRIME**

Interviewees associated the physical deterioration of the ward with increased crime and fear of crime. Several interviewees point to what they perceive to be negative changes in the ward. Michael remarked that there was a ‘a lot of deterioration, deterioration in the standard of maintenance of homes and things like that, and the streets [and] just about everybody has got high walls and high fences.’ Jessica lives in Glenwood but also has a property in Glenmore that is rented out to university students. While she has not been robbed, some of the students have been victims of crime. She blames this on the

_little bridge they cross to go to that Southway Mall Shopping Centre. That bridge is a problem because there’s a lot of bush and you can’t see who’s in that bush…. And these guys are sitting, walking around, watching, they look for cellphones, It’s not that bad if you’re not talking on your cell phone or wearing fashion jewellery._

Naomi, who moved to Durban from Cape Town in 2005, noted a significant “decline” in the ward over the past six years. By “decline” she meant an increase in ‘levels of crime and grime’ due to ‘a lot of, excuse me, Blacks moving into the area’ who are ‘not very worried about litter. You see them walking, and they are eating something and [they] throw it on the ground. When we first moved in here, it was so beautiful.’ With regard to crime, Naomi is convinced that ‘as much as the police say it’s not increasing, I don’t know whether it’s because we are so aware now that we are hearing about everything, but crime is definitely on the increase here in Glenwood.’ Naomi wishes that she was living ‘just one road up because you can see how the grime has sort of crept up [northwards] from street to street’. She also identified an area known to locals as “Woonga Park”, situated under a bridge on a railway line where Che Guevara Road meets Maydon Road, as problematic. According to Naomi, around 200 people ‘are there, all foreigners. And the amount of prostitution!!! That is where all the crime is. They [criminals] run there and hide amongst the people.’ While Woonga Park does not fall within the boundaries of Ward 33, it is Louis’ perception that this group is contributing directly to crime in the ward.
Place is important in crime and criminal activity; within neighbourhoods, certain spaces are more prone to criminal activity. This may be ‘a street corner, address, building, or street segment’ (Eck & Weisburd, 1995: 1). Thus, Susan was robbed at a park while Naomi identified Woonga Park as a problem. Councillor Warwick Chapman, who has an intimate knowledge of the area from his many years of residence and active political engagement in the ward, identified vagrancy, open spaces, and derelict buildings as contributing to residents’ sense of urban decay.

The Clover Dairy site at the corner of Sydney and Francois roads in Umbilo is one such area. It has been partially demolished but most of the rubble remains on the property, with people ‘living in sort of caves there.’ According to Chapman, this constitutes a health hazard and is threatening printing businesses in the area because the dust affects their filtration systems.

Councillor Chapman also cited Morans Lane, which is close to the Berea Centre, and runs one way from Berea to Che Guevara Roads, as a problem. On the right hand side of Morans, he points out, ‘for almost the entire length is a park. It’s a dumping ground. It’s a taxi rank, it’s a construction yard…. Ask yourself, “what impact does that have on the local community?”’ According to Chapman, the park is occupied by gangs and foreign nationals.

Figure 24: Neglected areas in Morans Lane, Berea
Source: Chapman, 2013
Councillor Chapman also pointed to low-income residential apartment blocks such as Flamingo Court in Umbilo Road, and Lantern Heath at the intersection of Umbilo and Gale Roads, as examples of urban decay. These buildings were state-owned rental stock that was sold to tenants at nominal prices. In order to give working class people ownership of flats, body corporates were set up. While not wanting to sound ‘condescending,’ Chapman said that ‘they can’t run a body corporate. The best run body corporates are run by accountants and doctors, people with skills and credibility in the community.’ The body corporates failed and court-appointed administrators took over the buildings. Chapman is convinced that they ‘are working in cahoots with investors and dragging the building as far down as possible, putting people in a situation where they have to sell in order to get out of debt.’ A few individuals own most of the flats which are rented to ‘shady’ characters. Chapman laments that the buildings have been ‘taken over by gangs and foreigners’, adding to residents’ perception of the collapse of “law and order”.

How do the residents’ perceptions of urban decay relate to fear of crime?

Visual cues influence residents’ perceptions of crime. Areas that are densely populated, have physically deteriorated, have a substantial number of transients, and contain ‘less-than-desirable’ commercial establishments are associated with high crime (Stark, 1987: 894). Farrall et al. (2009: 92-93) point out that urban environmental cues are associated with fear of crime. Such cues may include

- poor lighting, graffiti, litter, vandalism, hiding places for criminals, poor state of buildings, disorderly behaviour, areas adjoining vacant areas such as car parks, parks, or factories, the positioning of shrubberies, numbers of people that are present in the area, noise pollution, dogs and “dog shit”, perceptions of the people in the area, discarded needles, and empty and abandoned streets.

Parts of Ward 33, as described by Naomi, Chapman, and Jessica, fit this profile and when residents begin moving out of an area, it has a snow-ball effect. Urban flight leads to abandoned buildings (such as Clover Dairies) which, in turn, attract the “wrong” kinds of people who compound the crime problem. Crime becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Captain Patrick blames the local government for “decay” in the area. He points out, for example, that although there has been a multi-million rand upgrade of Davenport Centre, officials are allowing ‘traders outside there with a table and sweets….So what are you developing? We cannot talk about a first world country and have third world ideologies.’ A hostel has been built in the ward and the Council has failed to upgrade some of its flats. As Patrick points out, ‘instead of the Council saying, “lets pump some money in here, let’s try and do this place up, it’s either one of two things, it’s abandoned or its illegally occupied”.’ These changes are exacerbating the class divide within the ward:

When you talk about lower and upper (Ward 33), in the lower area what do you have? Lower Umbilo – what’s happening? Factories, workers, hostel, unoccupied land, squatters, the beer hall, etc. What level of people do you think will be there all the time? Then, when you talk about the Upper part? Because of the manner in which it is being controlled by a white minority that will complain bitterly about prostitution,
about a shack, or whatever, they manage to maintain that level of existence, and these people at the bottom will continue going backwards.

Figure 25 & 26: Abandoned Site (Clover Dairies), Umbilo
Source: Umbilo SAPS

DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE AND FEAR OF CRIME

Respondents also emphasised the changing demographics of Ward 33 over the past two decades as a result of residential deracialisation and the influx of foreigners. Jessica describes the area where she lives in Glenwood as 'a real mix.' One sign is 'a guy around there with a big Hindu statue, a lot of people that moved out of the townships, coming here.' While Jessica speaks of this change in a matter-of-fact way, other respondents were concerned with some aspects of change. Residents are not imagining demographic change. A comparison of the 2001 and 2011 census figures shows that there has been significant change in Ward 33.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>7280</td>
<td>11525</td>
<td>+ 4245</td>
<td>+ 58.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16455</td>
<td>11778</td>
<td>- 4677</td>
<td>- 28.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian or Asian</td>
<td>2191</td>
<td>2659</td>
<td>+ 468</td>
<td>+ 21.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>+ 343</td>
<td>+31.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,003</td>
<td>27,681</td>
<td>+678</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001 and 2011, Department of Statistics
Ward 33 has seen a dramatic decline in the white population which dropped from 60.93 percent in 2001 to 42.54 percent in 2011. In contrast, the Black African population increased from 26.95 percent to 41.63 percent in the same period. This data most likely does not take into account another change referred to below, namely, the presence of students during the academic year, who may not have filled out the census form, either due to tardiness or because their parents did so in their areas of residence, as well as foreign refugees and migrants.

Susan, who lives at the border of Glenwood / Umbilo, points to the considerable changes since the Group Areas Act (GAA) was ‘lifted so now it’s intercultural, people bringing their own cultures.’ Mary, who lives close to Eden College (which was previously a Jewish School called Carmel College and then Crawford until 2006), at the corner of Dan Pienaar and Wanless roads in Glenmore, emphasised demographic changes in her more upper middle class part of the ward:

Twenty years ago when we moved into the neighbourhood, it was very old people and very young families. The demographics have changed totally. That specific block that I live in, was a lot of people with young families that were going to the Jewish day school that used to be Carmel College. A lot of those people have moved out so the school is no longer Jewish. So that is number one. Number two, obviously a lot of people of colour have moved in and number three, in very recent times, in my direct neighbourhood a lot of people related to the Catholic Church on the circle have moved in.

Captain Patrick joined the police force in 1983 and has been at the Umbilo SAPS since 2007. He said that moving to Umbilo ‘was a shock for me because knowing Umbilo was normally fully a white area, a lot of non-whites have moved into the area.’ W/O Percy, who joined the police force in 1982, underscored the deracialisation of the ward to which he attributes population increase:

before the [1994] elections, this was a predominantly white residential area, if you look at a typical white family, it’s like mother, father, two kids. Since then the area has been opened up, with a lot of African people moving into the area, extended families, they bring their grannies, brothers, sisters, I would say the population has almost tripled.

This observation is not supported by census figures, although there may have been underreporting.

Some of the respondents pointed to the changed use of public spaces to emphasise demographic change. Jessica refers to changes in the way that Umbilo Park is used: ‘at the end of the month there’s normally quite a lot more [activity] because people get paid and you do get weddings.’ Before people of colour moved into the ward, weddings were almost always held at the church, with the bridal couple visiting the park only to take photographs. Another respondent pointed to the Glenwood Library, which is based at the Glenwood Shopping Centre at the intersection of Che Guevara and Hunt Roads, as symptomatic of change in the area. ‘Go there on any afternoon and it is full of Black children. Ten years ago there were hardly any Blacks in the library.’ While this can be interpreted as an objective observation, the tone in which it was said
suggested that this was a negative development. These changes are contributing to residents' overall sense of a takeover of the ward by people of colour, a trend that is associated in many minds with the general decay of the area, reduced social cohesion, and an increase in crime. The role of racial stereotypes in residents' perceptions of neighbourhood crime is explored below.

The past decade has witnessed a considerable increase in the number of Black students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) and the Durban University of Technology (DUT). Many of these students are from out of Durban and, according to W/O Percy, ‘instead of commuting, find residence in the area. The flats have been converted into residence. So if you look at a one bedroom flat, you will expect two people to be living in it. But the situation is four or five.’ Some homeowners have converted their homes into student residences.

One interviewee, who lives close to the Glenwood Shopping Centre, noted that some neighbours see a link between the presence of young people in the neighbourhood and the level of crime:

One of the things that sort of struck me as odd was the beginning of this year, somebody said, “oh, the students are back so there’s more crime.” I don’t really know if there’s any evidence of that whatsoever but it’s certainly a perception that people have, and because the person that told it to me was an estate agent, it’s probably something that isn’t isolated.

Naomi did not associate students directly with crime but did consider them a ‘nuisance’. In ‘a block behind here,’ she noted, ‘we had students living. It was an absolute nightmare because they would talk and scream out of their window. Talk, it’s like they are right here in your yard until four or five o’ clock in the morning.’ This contributes to her overall sense of the neighbourhood’s “decay”. Stories of noisy students feature regularly in community newspapers. For example, a Berea Mail (16 August 2013: 1) front page headline ‘Students party while neighbours suffer’, related the concerns of residents living close to a student hostel in Denham Place, Glenwood. They complained that calls to the police were in vain and that this has been a constant problem since the hostel, which contravened several by-laws, opened in 2011. Tensions are ongoing between students and residents.

The transition from apartheid to a post-apartheid society is posing challenges for longstanding residents, some of whom appear to be struggling to come to terms with the stark cultural differences that are a feature of the post-apartheid period. The fact that most newcomers are people of colour adds a racial dimension to perceptions. Some residents expressed a nostalgia for a lost past, such as the disappearance of a “Jewish” school (though the school still exists, it has a different orientation) and with it the outmigration of a “[Jewish] community within a community”. It is not that this respondent viewed Jewish people as a special and “respectable” group, but rather that the movement of Jewish people out of the community means the disappearance of longstanding and important institution (the Jewish school). It is seen as one more sign of loss in the community.
The influx of students, people of colour, and foreign migrants into the ward is associated with crime and grime.

Some older residents, according to Chantal, are beset by ‘paranoia, you know, the idea that every man or woman who is walking down the street or even lurking on the corner is going to commit a crime is a very bad, unhealthy kind of attitude.’ (Perceived) higher crime rates are feeding into racist thinking, a point reinforced at CPF meetings. Demographic change is fostering stereotypes about newcomers - drug peddlers, prostitutes, unemployed foreigners / potential criminals - as residents try to make sense of their changing world. As Sacco (2005: 135) points out:

_Increases in levels of ethnic or racial heterogeneity contribute to a sense of discomfort on the part of the neighbourhood residents who feel that their neighbourhood is undergoing a decline_. … _While it may be politically incorrect to express racist attitudes openly, expressions of anxiety about crime and criminals are usually regarded as perfectly appropriate forms of public discussion._

Amy related an example of this association of race with criminal activity:

_You see a lot of people just walking, you know. [My son], the other day, he just left home, he phoned, said be careful there is somebody walking, he doesn’t look right. Twenty minutes later he phones, he says two doors away he did jump over the wall and he got caught. So they take their chances, like well-dressed and maybe they will be reading a paper while walking…. These kinds of things are happening around now. But not before, we didn’t hear of anything._

Mary provided an anecdote about the dilemma that residents like her face because of their association of race with crime:

_Once, the broom man irritated me because he put his finger on my bell and he didn’t take it off … and within two seconds there was a neighbourhood watch car there. It was in the afternoon on the weekend and he came up to the guy and he said, “get out of this area. You are not welcome here.” On the one hand the poor guy is trying to earn a living … but he escorted him out of the neighbourhood, and on the other hand he [broom man] did piss me off because he had his finger on my bell. So I thought, where do I stand in this? I don’t like the neighbourhood watch. They are very gung-ho, they are very “bolshie”, they are very racist, and they are very in-your-face. But on the other hand it comes in handy and they are there._

Mary’s comment points to the relationship between race and class. This incident may be partly about race but there is a strong element of class. Black working class people are perfectly acceptable as domestic assistants but are not acceptable when they come to the suburbs outside of this master–servant relationship.
Some South Africans believe that they are specially targeted by criminals because of their race. A September 2012 Victim of Crime Survey by Statistics South Africa showed that whites were far more afraid of being victims even though, on the basis of crime statistics, Black Africans (the official census categorisation) have more reason to fear. Half of the whites surveyed said that the fear of crime prevented them from going to parks; a third avoided public transport; and a quarter said they would not walk to neighbourhood shops. Whites were 50 percent to four times more afraid of being victims of crime than Black Africans even though in the year preceding the survey, Black people had experienced higher rates of robbery, assault and sexual attacks (De Wet, 2013).

The belief that white South Africans are under siege by criminals was given international credibility in 2009 when Cape Town born Brandon Huntley successfully claimed that his fear of crime that targeted whites made him a candidate for asylum. The Canadian Immigration Board granted him refugee status, but that decision was overturned by a federal court. Huntley's appeal to the Supreme Court in 2012 failed and he approached the Canadian Immigration Board to review the decision. Some concerned citizens set up websites to record and protest attacks on white Afrikaners who feel particularly threatened by violence in South Africa, while contemporary Afrikaans protest music portrays a sense of being besieged by criminals (Steyn, 2011). Given this racial thinking about crime it is understandable why fear of victimisation increased among many residents following the influx of people of colour into the ward.

Captain Patrick points out that residents associate crime with race because 'if you do a comparison, write down the total number of people arrested, work out Black, white, Asian, Coloured, foreigners, do it in graph, you will see that more people of a certain race are being detained.' Patrick's challenge was taken up and an analysis was made by race of every arrest made at Umbilo Police Station, which serves wards 32 and 33, for the three months of August, September, and October 2012. Appendix F is an example of the entries made by the police (names have been blocked out for the sake of confidentiality; unfortunately this form did not include the address of those charged or where the crime was committed, which would have further refined our analysis). Appendix G is a summary of the results.

The table shows that well over 90 percent of those arrested were Black. Of course, given that Africans make up over 80 percent of the population of the country, if not the ward, it is statistically expected that they should comprise the majority of those involved in criminal activity. In the public mind, however, crime is associated with race as if it is a genetic trait and, in a context of greater numbers of people of colour in the ward; residents associate demographic change with an increase in crime and urban decay.

**FOREIGN NATIONALS, XENOPHOBIA AND FEAR OF CRIME**

According to Captain Patrick, the demographic make-up of the ward is also affected by ‘the influx of foreigners who are ‘not being housed properly and there is no proper structure to deal with them, they have also contributed to the crime and especially in Umbilo.’ W/O Percy is also concerned about foreign migrants and refugees; he points out that, in most parts of the world, refugees are registered and given a
subsistence allowance. In South Africa, on the other hand, refugees comprise ‘a potpourri of people from all over Africa. The only recourse [in the absence of an allowance] many got is to sell drugs, prostitution and common petty crimes to feed themselves.’

At the CPF Area 1 meeting on 4 October 2012, Captain Marais of the Umbilo SAPS also said that many foreigners were living in abandoned or partially demolished buildings, and ‘steal anything to make a buck, be it copper or bins.’ Unemployed and homeless, they ‘walk around all night scrounging in the bins for food.’ From a police perspective, foreigners and illegal immigrants are contributing to crime in the ward.
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**Figure 27: Homeless Person, Ward 33**
Source: Umbilo SAPS

![Image 2](image2.jpg)

**Figure 28: Drugs and goods recovered by police**
Source: Umbilo SAPS

Police work has a social and structural context, and at the present time there are strong feelings of xenophobia in the country at large. These wider xenophobic tendencies are apparent in the ward. Mary, who was a victim of crime by ‘illegal immigrants’ felt strongly that ‘the issue of illegal immigration has to be clamped down on.’ This message was reinforced at the CPF meeting on 12 November 2012 when Brad spoke of the nefarious influence of ‘Nigerians and the like’, expressing xenophobic sentiments that reflected negative stereotypes widely held among South Africans. When a member of the audience complained about a nightclub in the area, Brad said that every area had a similar nightclub with ‘drug dealers and prostitutes’ because the police are ‘thinly stretched,’ lacking the resources and ‘courage to do anything, and the local security companies don’t have the teeth to do the things we would like them to do - like raid these clubs or try and close down drug dealers.’ The result is that foreigners ‘have flooded in here. How are they making money? Out of drugs and buying stolen property ... [and] prostitution.’

The literature does not point to a clear correlation between crime and prostitution but, judging from the response of those who attended the CPF meeting in Glenwood, as well as interviewees, the residents of Ward 33 see the presence of prostitutes as proof of the overall decline of the area into one that attracts unruly elements, including drug dealers. Such perceptions are contributing to the overall “moral panic” among residents about crime in the ward.

While CPFs are meant to bring the police and community closer together, because the “problem” segment of the ward (foreigners) is not integrated into the local community, the gap between them the police remains wide and the relationship is one of suspicion and fear.
Residents’ fear of crime in Ward 33 and their perceptions that crime is completely “out of hand” are not supported by the statistics. Appendix H (‘Ward 33 Crime Statistics 2005-2011’) shows that crime incidents per 1 000 people have increased in cases of assault, sexual crimes, residential robbery (although there was a decrease from 2009 to 2011), and carjacking (also decreased from 2009 to 2011); while they have declined in cases of common assault, residential burglary, culpable homicide, general theft, murder, aggravated robbery, theft out of motor vehicles, common robbery, and attempted murder.

The precinct of the Umbilo SAPS (which includes both Wards 32 and 33) is certainly not the hardest hit crime area in the wider Durban area. While the description “high crime” is relative, as the comparison of Umbilo with Umlazi (Appendix E) shows that the situation is much worse in the latter area when it comes to crimes like murder and attempted murder, relativity does not really matter in such situations. Respondents believe that they are besieged by crime, in particular serious crimes such as carjacking, residential housebreaking, and street robberies. The perception that crime is rampant, and that white South Africans in particular are targeted, is a national phenomenon even though, as De Wet (2013) shows, ‘the risk for rape, aggravated assault and robbery, as well as murder and attempted murder is considerably greater for the poor black township dweller than say, a rich white person.’

Why is the perception of rampant crime so strong if it is not borne out statistically? To get to the heart of this problem we need to ask, as Hall et al. (1978: viii) do with respect to Britain:

How has the “law and order” ideology been constructed? What social forces are constrained and contained by its construction? What forces stand to benefit from it? What real facts and anxieties is it mobilizing?’

The media, police, and social networks all play key roles in the social construction of fear of crime. Crime therefore has a social as well as a statistical or legal basis. According to Hall et al. (1978: 52), agencies of public significance such as the police and the media do not simply ‘respond to “moral panics”. They are part of the circle out of which “moral panics” develop. Part of the paradox is that they ‘inadvertently amplify the deviancy they seem so absolutely committed to controlling.’ Information about criminal activity or potential criminal activity received through the print media, social networks, government agencies, citizens’ groups, and the police increases residents’ perceptions of levels of crime in the neighbourhood and their anxiety over it. Such information, at the very least, reminds residents that being a victim of crime is very likely in the neighbourhood and that they should be aware of potential risks.

As noted in chapter two, another factor generating fear is marginality. Criminal activity and the reaction to it, does not occur in a vacuum. The relationship between the majority of respondents in this study and those perceived to be the cause of criminal activity has a long history that certainly has a bearing on present perceptions. Feelings of marginalisation among minority groups in South Africa around issues of politics,
economics, sport, education, work, and so on is contributing to a general feeling of being “under siege”. The moral panic around crime is part of a wider crisis of “belonging” and should be seen in relation to insecurities which include personal anxieties as well as national and international concerns which, cumulatively, are producing ‘anxiety which might find an outlet in crime talk’ (Enders & Jennett, 2009: 202-203). The root causes of fear run deep and solutions will not be as simple as beefing up physical security measures around homes.

From a policing perspective, the “threat” to the neighbourhood is from inside and outside the ward. Within the neighbourhood, the crime threat is seen to emanate from urban decay and the presence of “undesirable” elements, including foreign nationals and students, while the outside threat is in the form of criminals from nearby areas coming into ward for “easy pickings”, patients and visitors to hospitals who attract criminals; and others who commute to work in the area. As crime and word of crime is disseminated through various media, residents' fear of crime increases. The narratives also associate race with crime. Although respondents tried not to couch their views in racial terms, the terms ‘crime’ and ‘black crime’ sometimes appear to be synonymous. The movement of people across neighbourhood, provincial, and national borders is likely to intensify in the future. In this era of great mobility, Farrall et al. (2009: 108) note that, ‘we have less direct knowledge about those around us,’ and the ‘unpredictable stranger’ is the target of generalised as well as specific fears and anxieties. Xenophobic attacks are increasing across South Africa. In the local context, “stranger” is associated with South Africans of colour (in particular Black people) and African foreigners.

While the statistics indicate that residents’ perceptions of the risk of crime are not objectively warranted, does it really matter whether fear of crime meets the reality of crime? As Susan's sentiments at the beginning of this chapter suggest, many residents are consumed by fear of crime to the point that it is an everyday topic of conversation and even influences the kinds of preventative measures they are taking, including areas or persons to be avoided.

Chapter five examines social cohesion in Ward 33 and its relationship to crime and fear of crime.
Chapter four examined some of the factors that are contributing to the fear of crime amongst residents of Ward 33. This chapter focuses on the behavioural, spatial, and attitudinal responses of residents to this fear in the context of the debate on the impact of social cohesion and diversity on responses to fear of crime. As already highlighted, one of the aims of this dissertation is to interrogate the “reality” of social cohesion in the specific location of Ward 33 and analyse its impact on residents’ responses to their fear of crime. Do residents, for example, feel part of a cohesive local neighbourhood and mobilise collectively and look out for one another? Or, do they feel isolated, blaming the increasing ethnic, racial, class, and national diversity in the neighbourhood, and are consequently barricading themselves?

As chapter four shows, most of the interviewees perceive the ward to have changed dramatically over the past two decades with regard to its demographic make-up. This is reinforced by census statistics. Increasing diversity is not unique to this ward or even South Africa; mobility and fluidity are features of contemporary life in most parts of the world. With specific regard to Ward 33, W/O Percy points to some of the tensions resulting from demographic transformation and cultural differences:

> You find like the whites, they were privileged for a long time, so they get together and network, they want to look after themselves. But then, we have got a lot of Indians living in this community, a lot of Blacks, but they don’t seem to be interested. If you live in suburbia what we normally have is a lot of Indians feel alienated irrespective of whether you are Hindu or Muslim or whatever. If you are having a function, you like to entertain; you get 30 cars arriving at your house. Whites don’t actually do that, they don’t like that. If you look at memorial services, the whites don’t actually have a memorial service at the house. They either go to a church or do a small informal thing at Doves. But from our [Indian] viewpoint we call everybody, everybody needs to attend, even Blacks, they celebrate whatever, they sacrifice cows, and we get in the SPCA and animal cruelty, etc. complaining.

W/O Percy’s views are fascinating in the way in which he uses ‘culture’ and ‘community’ interchangeably and the fact that he attaches culture to both race and religion. From his perspective, demographic changes are inducing greater religious, racial, ethnic, class, and cultural heterogeneity in the neighbourhood, as a result of which, he believes, ‘we have a really fractured community.’ The relationship between diversity and social cohesion is interrogated in this chapter.

While there is no universally accepted definition of social cohesion, it generally refers to residents having ‘common aims and objectives, social order, social solidarity and a sense of place attachment’ (Letki, 2008: 100). The burgeoning literature on social cohesion suggests that it is an important concern of many social scientists and policymakers. In part, it is driven by concerns about crime and the fear of crime, and in part by post-9/11 anxieties about the Muslim presence in Western societies and the impact of the policy of multiculturalism which recognised and encouraged diversity. According to most studies, social capital is an
important dimension of social cohesion. The impact of diversity on social cohesion at national, regional, and neighbourhood level is an issue that scholars are grappling with in many parts of the world. For example, it is on the research agenda in Western Europe, the United States, Canada, and Australia.

One of the most cited theorists in this area is Robert Putnam, whose 2007 study claimed that in the short term, diversity results in less trust and solidarity, more scarce cooperation and mutual help, negative evaluation of neighbourhoods, and residents avoiding public spaces and having fewer contacts and networks. In Putnam’s words, they “hunker down” or ‘pull in like a turtle’ (2007: 149). Explaining why ethnic concentration increases the tendency to “hunker down”, Scheepers, Hans, and Pelzer (2013: 94) proposed…

*that the more people perceive less similar and vice versa more dissimilar others in their surroundings, e.g., ethnic minorities, to threaten their status and habits, the more they may become discomforted, due to their perceived devalued status and habits, possibly perceived to be tainted by out-groups surrounding them; their perceived devalued status and habits may consequently induce social disconnections. Hence they hunker down: avoid public spaces, refrain from social contacts and evaluate their neighbourhood unfavourably.*

Putnam’s proposition spawned widespread research into heterogeneity and social cohesion. As Portes and Vickstrom (2011) point out in their overview of the literature, the results are not unanimous or conclusive in confirming Putnam’s findings. The relationship between diversity and social cohesion is not linear but depends on multiple factors. They go further to argue that there is a ‘dark side’ to social cohesion, an extreme case being the Weimar Republic which had a vibrant civil society that was used for evil ends by the Nazis.

This chapter examines some of the residents’ responses to crime and the fear of crime, and how this is seen to be contributing to a breakdown in memorialised social cohesion. This includes such issues as the movement of longstanding residents out of the ward, which is coupled with the movement of people of colour and foreign nationals into it; residents’ changing relationship with public spaces; and instances of civic action aimed at mobilising residents against the perceived crime problem in the ward. The concluding section reflects on the impact, if any, of social cohesion in the ward, or the absence thereof, on residents’ responses to crime and the fear of crime.

**SEMIJACTION & EMIGRATION**

A recurring theme during the interviews was the movement of many long established residents out of Ward 33. As noted in chapter two, Richard Ballard speaks of ‘semigration’ to refer to residents shutting themselves off in gated communities where, they believe they can maintain ‘Western’ and ‘First World’ living standards. Ballard (2005) described these communities as ‘privatised apartheid’, whereby residents live in South Africa but want as little to do with it as possible. As the statistics in chapter four and anecdotal
evidence shows, many former residents have moved out of Ward 33. For the purposes of this dissertation, it is not feasible to track those who have moved out of the ward in order to establish why they did so and where they have settled. However, anecdotal evidence provides pointers in this regard. Interviewees mentioned where their neighbours, friends, or relatives have relocated. Mary, for example, stated that some of her neighbours have moved into gated communities, a decision that they did not take lightly but, like her, they felt that this new lifestyle provided a feeling of security:

*If you want me to feel safe in my neighbourhood, I would like a gated community and it embarrasses me to say this, because it’s shocking. Most of my friends have left and they have moved to Umhlanga and La Lucia and they live in communities where they have access control. They feel much better. I know what it means culturally. I am an academic. I know what it means to have a gated community. But that is how I would feel safe. Who comes in and who comes out of my area, I would like that controlled. I would feel safer. Would I like it? No. Would I feel safer? Yes.*

In addition to ‘semigration’, whereby citizens are shutting themselves off in gated communities, supplemented by security apparatus such as boom gates, high walls, razor wire electric fences, and armed response security companies, other residents are leaving the country altogether. W/O Percy stated that over the past decade and a half, many former residents of the area, whom he knew personally, have emigrated, most citing high levels of crime as a factor in their decision to emigrate.

*When I arrived here, I think about fifty percent of the population were the older generation. Since then, some have died, and a lot of them, their kids went overseas and studied in England and whatever, and if you look at the media they report on all the crimes…. So people have taken their parents over to New Zealand, England. A lot of them moved out, from 1994 they were selling their houses.*

Migration out of Ward 33 is changing its demographic make-up. It emerged from the interviews that there is more outward movement in the northern part of the ward where sellers are able to command higher prices for their properties and are therefore able to relocate to more “desirable” areas. The same does not apply to lower-middle to working class families in the Umbilo area, where properties are worth less to begin with. Ironically, these residents probably have a greater stake in the local area and are possibly motivated to work harder to make the area safe and habitable because they know that they cannot take the escape route to a gated community.

While many former residents may have left the country altogether, several respondents, all from Umbilo, expressed a strong desire to remain. Some did so out of a sense of loyalty to the country and others because they believe that they are too old or lack the financial resources to do so. Despite her concern about crime in South Africa, Jessica, for example, is adamant that she will not emigrate:

*I think everyone gives that [emigration] a passing thought but, at the same time, you know, I think if you’re born in this country you see the good side – you see the climate, you see the beachfront. I love*
the beachfront, to go there, you see everybody all together in peace and I think to myself, if we went to the Middle East they’d be killing each other, or even the north of Africa. So the fact that they all got different beliefs, you get the Zionist baptising – and everyone’s together, it’s very special – the Chinese, China Mall – I mean, it’s all mixed.

Jessica clearly appreciates and welcomes diversity and is also able to contextualise the crime and violence in her neighbourhood in relation to episodes of violence in other parts of the world.

Ashley contends that she is too old to contemplate emigration but that her son would like to do so. However, his reason for wanting to go abroad is not crime or violence per se but unemployment, which he attributes to South Africa’s affirmative action policies.

My son - he would love to have gone over there [UK] but he’s too old. So I said to him, why go over there? They’ve got as much crime over there as we’ve got over here. South Africa is home. Life is what you make it. I know my young son complains that he can’t get a job because he’s got the wrong colour skin. I mean he has battled for years [for work].

Jessica and Ashley’s narratives show that individuals have multiple reasons for relocating or expressing a desire to move out of the ward. Some stressed that movement out of the ward of older residents has meant having to rebuild social engagement networks such as sports clubs, places of worship, and even socialising at the local pub or restaurant. Some may interpret this hankering for the past as nostalgia and as being socially exclusivist. Demographic change has no doubt made the ward more diverse. Some of the respondents associate this with negative outcomes, an assumption that is, as argued later in this chapter, debatable.

COMMUNITY & PUBLIC SPACES

Putnam’s “hunkering down” thesis has several dimensions. Two that are relevant here are ‘spatial’, which refers to avoiding public spaces, and ‘attitudinal’, which refers to evaluating one’s neighbourhood negatively (Scheepers, Schmeets, & Pelzer, 2013: 93). Some of the respondents avoid areas in the ward which they regard as ‘dangerous’ or minimise walking alone in the neighbourhood at certain times of the day. Naomi, for example, is adamant that she ‘just won’t walk alone now late at night. Before, up to about a year or two ago I would have quite easily felt safe to walk alone at night here. But I won’t do that now.’ This is due to the ‘hijackings in the area; you know near Woolworths at the top of Brand Road, in Cromwell, Ferguson Road, there have been quite a few hijackings.’ Ashley also avoids walking in the neighbourhood at night and would not do so during the day either if she had the choice; however, she has to collect her grandchildren from school:

I walk from here to Penzance School on the other side of Queen Mary Avenue, every day to fetch the children. I had been accosted once two years ago up in Nicholson Road by a young black man. He
wanted my bag and I wouldn’t give it to him and an Indian man running, shouted at a car passing – they caught him…. You don’t know what you’re going to do in the situation. But I didn’t know at the time that I could scream so loud [laughs]. I went to court but he wasn’t there so – so it was a waste of time really. But I have to walk. I don’t carry handbags or anything like that. I walk along the road.

Amy does not walk in the neighbourhood at all, day or night. ‘I won’t do it. Even once, twice I think, I did go with [my son], we took the dog for a walk just around here. But I must just see somebody walking by, God I tell him, “walk fast, walk fast”.’

Chantal was a regular walker (for fitness and leisure) until the mid-2000s:

_For a long time I used to walk early in the morning and at night – about eight o’clock, half past eight at night. I used to go to a church down the road and I used to walk home. I don’t think I’d do that now. I guess that’s about four or five years ago. I used to really feel quite safe. Well, I can’t say I wouldn’t go for a walk but you do just notice things and sometimes cross the road just to be safe, you know, if you see someone coming towards you that you don’t know. But, on the whole, most of the people that you meet – are going to and from work, to the university or something like that._

Susan too observed that times ‘have changed…. As a child it was like you could walk around freely, women could walk around freely, well, reasonably freely.’ The ‘biggest predator’, she points, ‘unfortunately can be men, you know, men. It’s a bit harsh but it’s very feminist.’ She does not have a car and relies on walking and public transportation, and takes “commonsense” precautions.

_It’s not safe but I do actually walk around if I have to. If I have to go to the shop in the night time or something, I’ll go – I’d take a chance. There’s traffic coming up and down … but I wouldn’t do it obviously in certain areas. I’ll put stuff in my pocket or I’ll put it in my hand and I don’t take a lot of money, just what I need, my cell phone I generally don’t take with me or I’ll put it down my brassiere but you got to be careful now because … like my friend was actually walking down the road and she was accosted but they actually stuck their hand down her dress because they know that that’s where women actually hide it – it used to just be like black ladies used to do that but now, you know, white people do it as well, but ya, he just put his hand down and stole her money._

While some residents are careful about where they walk in the neighbourhood, others pointed to reduced activity in public spaces such as parks and streets. According to Mary,

_Culturally, people don’t play in the streets, people don’t spill out into the road. People live on their own nuclear sort of areas. There is no public spaces. People don’t go to parks with their children. I mean in Europe every single area has a public park and all the children go and play. There is none of that. If you want your child to play on the swings you have to have your swings in your garden. It’s hideous and ugly, horrible._
This change is evident in residents’ relationship with Umbilo Park which is bounded by Oliver Lea Drive in Umbilo and Solomon Mahlangu (Edwin Swales VC) Drive on the Seaview side (see map below). Pupils from the nearby Brettonwood High School and domestic workers using public transport at the Southway Mall are amongst those who use the park as a thoroughfare. Once an important public space in the neighbourhood, most residents have stopped using the park for recreational purposes. As Councillor Chapman reflected bollards (security pillars) have been dug up and removed, grass and plants killed, cars have ended up in the ponds, women have raped, and others attacked and robbed. Vanessa Burger, founder of the Umbilo Action Group (UAG), noted that there is ‘amazing’ bird life in Umbilo Park on the freeway side. A bird club used to visit regularly to conduct research, ‘but half of their members were mugged so they don’t do it anymore. We have got black necked dwarfed bird also there which is a highly endangered species. The research programme has fallen by the way side.’

The *Sunday Tribune* (20 December 2009: 4) carried a large headline, ‘Disgrace in a Public Space’, which concluded that the park had ‘become an after-hours drinking spot. Partying by off-duty cops, the very people supposed to prevent public disturbances, isn’t helping.’ Residents complained of noise, music blaring from car speakers, drinking, and littering. Lindelani Zuke, volunteer education officer for the Wildlife and Environmental Society of South Africa (Wessa), said that one of the consequences of high crime, especially near the foot bridge at the Umbilo Canal, was an end to activities such as bird watching (*Sunday Tribune*, 20 December 2009).

In July 2011, then Umbilo CPF chairman, “Tuks” Khanyile, called on the police to act against rape in the vicinity of Umbilo Park after two incidents of rape in a three week period (*Daily News*, 8 July 2011). In November 2011, a man in his mid-20s was arrested for several alleged rapes. Operating at the bus stop in Grosvenor Road, Umbilo, he promised young women employment and lured them into the bushes in Umbilo Park (opposite the junction of Bottomley Road and Oliver Lea Drive) where he raped them. He was
caught after the fourth such incident. Burger identified Stellawood Cemetery and the footbridge over the Umbilo Canal as ‘dangerous’. High traffic levels on the southern freeway and dense bush made it difficult for victims’ screams for help to be heard. In May 2012, Burger called for extra police patrols, more lighting, sting operations, and the erection of a satellite police station to make the park safer. Lt Col Vincent Mdunge of KZN SAPS communications responded that ‘resources do not allow for around-the-clock static policing…’ (Looklocal, 2012).

Burger organized a ‘Reclaim Umbilo Park’ rally on 13 May 2013. She told a reporter:

_We have to take back this park, and we, as a community, have to stand up and do [this]. There is a lack of will from the police to do anything, and it is not about them not having enough resources, but about them being unwilling to do something. That's why we need to take action_ (Daily News, 8 May 2013).

The day of ‘fun, not fear’ was to include performances by Dalton Hostel Drummers & Dancers for Peace while a group of graffiti artists painted an eye on the bridge to stamp the community’s presence in the park. The rally was cancelled because of inclement weather and, as discussed below, the UAG subsequently closed shop.

Umbilo-based interviewees described Umbilo Park as being one of the most tranquil retreats in Durban at one time; a place for walks and family picnics. Its “decay” is perceived as symptomatic of the wider neglect of the area which is generating negative feelings towards the neighbourhood amongst many interviewees. The story of Umbilo Park underscores the fact that safety and security is tied to race and class. Whereas in parts of the ward affluent residents have organised private initiatives to supplement the work of the police, in areas where residents cannot do so, and require additional SAPS staff and resources to bring their service levels on par with affluent property owners, this not forthcoming.

**CIVIC ACTION**

Moro notes that civic action ‘implies the exercise of citizens’ powers in the public realm, such as the powers to produce information and knowledge, to change common awareness, to give the “social license to operate”, to constrain public institutions to effectively work, and to change material conditions’ (2010: 2). Whatever the feelings of the respondents about the negative impact of diversity on civic life, there is clear evidence of some residents’ participation at community level to solve local problems. Several civic initiatives have been initiated to combat crime and more generally to work towards improvements of various kinds.

**GLENMORE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH (GNW)**

The Glenmore Neighbourhood Watch (GNW) is one such initiative. It was formed by Peter Kisorous who was subsequently shot in his tea room during a robbery. The GNW caters for the Glenmore/Carrington Heights area and its chairman at the time of writing was Wally Coombe. According to its website, while some South Africans have chosen to emigrate, GNW members want to ‘stay and fight for our country –
suburb by suburb.’ The organisation has around 20 volunteers who patrol the area each night. A qualified psychological counsellor, Pat Foyle, is available to offer trauma counselling. Coombe believes that this vigilance has reduced crime in the area. Funds are raised through the sale of boerewors rolls at the Glenmore Supply Store on Friday evenings, which also serves to bring the local community together. Monies raised are used to purchase such items as portable radios and bullet proof vests. According to Coombe, the Kisorous shooting had a positive impact on the “community”, which in this context refers to a part of Glenmore:

After he was shot in a robbery, the community was brought together in quite a big way. We just took the whole neighbourhood watch to a new dimension, you know, in terms of getting people actively involved in combating crime; being the eyes and ears and everything and we since developed a very good relationship with Umbilo SAPS…. There is no financial reward for anyone, but we’re just passionate about keeping our area safe, and obviously the safer we keep it the better it is from a rateable value to ourselves. If you compare our crime stats to other areas, it’s significantly lower (Neighbourhood Watch, 2012).

Success in Glenmore inspired others in the ward. A Neighbourhood Watch was started in Glenwood with 20 volunteers. It is driven by Glen Kirk and Guy Perrins who have a close relationship with ADT Security which sponsors the airtime costs of all volunteers’ two-way radios (5 December 2012; http://www.looklocal.co.za/looklocal/content/en/berea).

**UMBILO BUSINESS FORUM (UBF)**

The Umbilo Business Forum (UBF) is a voluntary NPO, formed in February 2010 by six local businesses. According to its website, the UBF’s focus is to ensure that Umbilo ‘is developed and maintained so as to be conducive to attracting investment to the area thereby improving business performance, with a focus on effective service delivery, safety and security.’ Membership has now grown to around 50. The UBF has a close working relationship with the Umbilo SAPS, with two members of the SAPS, Captain Rakesh Premhid and Captain Glen Needle, serving as Associate Members on the UBF’s Executive. Police “successes” are reported on the UBF’s website each month.³ The UBF believes that more can be done by providing the eThekwini Area Based Management (Durban South Basin) with a consolidated business voice to engage with. ‘Crime and grime’ are high on the UBF’s agenda and one arm of the UBF, the Umbilo Service Delivery Forum, reports service delivery issues to the eThekweni Municipality to pressurise it to prioritise these issues. In November 2012, Tony Blaunfeldt, an “expert” in security and member of the Umbilo CPF, was

---
³ For example, on 8 June 2013, the website reported “SA Police successes, May 2013,” which included the recovery of three stolen vehicles, computer equipment, six cell phones, copper, a large quantity of drugs including dagga, heroin and whoonga, and more than 100 arrests including eight for drugs, 13 for loitering for prostitution, two for robbery, two for theft out of a motor vehicle, four for theft, and five for possession of suspected stolen property.
appointed fulltime Operations and Liaison Manager. The UBF meets monthly and an AGM has been held each year since inception\(^4\) (see Umbilo Business Forum, 2013)

**BULWER PARK REVITALISATION STRATEGY**

One of the interesting initiatives in the ward is the renewal of Bulwer Park, which is bounded by Helen Joseph Road on the north-eastern side; Bulwer Road to the south-east; and Lena Ahrens Road to the west. Until his relocation to the Western Cape in mid-2012, Councillor Chapman was involved in the project which aims to create an “open” space in order to reduce crime and encourage public use. As he explains:

*Bulwer Park was a no-go zone not long ago, trim down the trees, open the park up, light it better, the lights weren’t working until about a year ago, put amenities in there that bring the public to the park and then the space for criminals is reduced to nothing because someone who mugged someone in the park is now going to have 15 guys within 20 metres who is going to run and tackle them and give them a walloping. I understand that that might not be possible for every public open space but it’s a pilot project for trying to structure a community/municipal/public/private partnership where you are able to generate income through a couple of projects in the park that are still under way. And then that income is used by non-profit association that runs the park in partnership with the city. And that association can raise funds which is difficult for the city to do through donations and things like that. I don’t know if you have seen the gym yet. The thing that really appeals to me about the gym is that nine times out of ten the only people that are there are women and children and that is what we want to see in our parks. And it means something. It means that those people feel safe enough to go and play there. Otherwise they wouldn’t be there and that is very, very important…. A lot of the criticism is that these are things that only white people want. Go into the park at any day and take a freeze frame and do a count. I promise you nine times out of ten the bulk of the people using the facilities are in fact black. Black, black, black. So I don’t think those arguments carry weight anymore. And if it’s an income thing then the wealthier people are off at the Virgin Active [Gym] and here less wealthy people are able to use a public facility.*

Bulwer Park started as a pilot project of the eThekwini Municipality’s Sustainable Public Spaces Programme, which is part of the 2006 *Integrated Development Plan’s (IDP) Quality Living Environment Plan, 2010 and beyond*. Plans for upgrading the park began in July 2010 with a community participation process coordinated by Imagine Durban, an initiative started in 2007 by the eThekweni Municipality in partnership with Sustainable Cities International (SCI) and Sustainable International Network (SIN). Feedback from local residents and the Child Friendly City Campaign led to the development of an Urban Design Framework and the formation of a stakeholder group after three meetings in the ward (Walford, 2012). The Child Friendly City Campaign concluded in its report that ‘despite its attractiveness as a large green space, the park has become less frequently used in recent years due to vagrancy, litter, unhygienic

---

\(^4\) At the AGM on 27 March 2013, the following members were appointed to the Executive Committee: Bernie Carr (of A&B Electrical), Gareth Jones (Swanlite), Michael Rockey (Battery Centre), Tony Caloba (Pizzetta), Keith Love (Avbob), who is the chairman, and Ed Carmody (Spilltech).
conditions of dog and human excrement, real or perceived lack of safety and its general derelict appearance' (eThekwini, 2012).

According to Chapman, widely advertised public meetings were held in Glenwood and there were meetings with municipal officials, community workshops, including meetings with residents with children, and a user perception research study was undertaken. One of the striking things that emerged in these meetings was that residents wanted to be involved in managing the park rather than leaving it to the municipality. The first phase placed emphasis on encouraging the use of the park for fitness. A multi-purpose footpath/track was built around the park, outdoor gym equipment was provided on the Bath/Davenport Road side of the park, lighting was improved, and more benches, bins and water fountains were installed. Tree pruning and felling, including the removal of some exotic trees, was necessary to improve lighting and security. Future plans include commercial developments, a link-up with the KZNSA gallery, an upgraded playground area, and building an amphitheatre to encourage public performances (Walford, 2012).

This is now a well utilised public space with regular community events such as fetes and flea markets.

![Figure 30: Food & Craft Lovers Market, Bulwer Park](image)

*Source: Author, 2013*

**UMBILO COMMUNITY POLICE FORUM (CPF)**

It may be argued that Community Policing Forums (CPF) are another example of civic action. These are government “creations” that were launched from 1997 to ensure that the police, as publicly funded arbiters of the law, are not the only policing actors. CPFs, it was hoped, would report criminal activity to the police, keep a check on police excesses, and help to foster positive relations between the police and the community (Marks, 2010: 312). The Umbilo CPF is attached to the Umbilo SAPS whose jurisdiction includes the suburbs of Glenmore, Glenwood, Umbilo, Carrington Heights, Congella, and the University of KwaZulu-Natal, an area of 22 km² sq.

At the time when Captain Patrick was interviewed in 2012, the Umbilo area was divided into four CPF sectors (as shown in the Map below, figure 31).  

---

5 Sector 1 consists of the area between Berea and Alan Paton Roads (McDonald) and between South Ridge and Williams Roads; Sector 2 consists of Glenwood and the University between Alan Paton Road (McDonald) and Sydney Road between Rick Turner Road (Francois) and Anniversary Avenue; Sector 3 consists of Glenmore, Carrington
Carried a notice dated 29 August 2012 stating that the executive of Sectors 3 and 4 had resigned, leaving the ward with just two active sectors. One negative result of CPFs is uneven police services across the country because residents’ commitment and resources differ from neighbourhood to neighbourhood, leaving affluent areas at an advantage relative to poorer and rural areas (Legget, 2005: 590). This is evident in the case of the Umbilo SAPS where CPFs are not functioning equally well across the precinct.

Heights, and parts of Umbilo inland of Selborne Road and south of Rick Turner Road; and Sector 4 consists of the area between Selborne Sarnia Roads, Bartle and Sydney Roads, and south of Rick Turner Road.
Figure 31: Map distinguishing the four CPF sectors within Ward 33

Source: eThekwini Municipality, 2013 (adapted by author)
In theory, the CPF appears to be a good tool to rally the neighbourhood in the fight against crime and perceived disorder. However, experience thus far suggests that this is not the case. At the CPF meeting on 4 October 2012, which I attended, chairman, Rob Hackenbruch conceded that the CPF was ‘not functioning in the area’ and stressed the need for a solid relationship between the community and police to fight crime. Captain Patrick, the Crime Prevention Officer at Umbilo SAPS, described the relationship between the police and the CPF as ‘strained’ and urged improved relations because the police and community are ‘two sides of the same coin and cannot survive without each other.’ During a subsequent interview, Naomi also stressed that the relationship between the CPF and police ‘sort of broke down and that is now why they are having their monthly community meetings … they need to win the community over again [as] the community do not trust Umbilo Police Station.’ According to Councillor Chapman, he spent almost six months facilitating negotiations between the CPF and SAPS in order to resume their monthly meetings, which he eventually succeeded in doing in 2012.

Vanessa Burger, who moved to Umbilo in the early 1990s and lives across from Umbilo Park, on the southern side, was involved in the CPF and served twice as chairperson of Sector Four. She formed the Umbilo Action Group (UAG) in mid-2008 because she felt that police corruption and inability to tackle crime and violence ‘required a strong unified community voice and action.’ The CPF, she felt, was no more than a ‘“PR” exercise for the police; it was being co-opted by the police to do its bidding.’ Members of the CPF who criticised the police and demanded accountability were ‘targeted, undermined and even intimidated.’ She came to the conclusion that in order to be effective she had to ‘be outside the structure for the CPF’ (Burger, 2013a).

Tension between the police and the CPF is not unique to Umbilo. Chiliza (2004), for example, found that in Durban North there was a great deal of disagreement between the community and police over ‘the functions and processes of the CPFs…..The community members tend to be more concerned about their oversight role over the police, whilst the police tend to be more protective of their operational independence and organizational control.’ There are also power struggles over who gets to speak for the “community”. Similar conclusions have been reached in other parts of the country.

A key question that these narratives raise is which “community” is being referred to in the discourse. At the 4 October 2012 CPF meeting, Colonel Gerard Mkhize, Umbilo SAPS Station Commander, noted that there were approximately a hundred people at the meeting in a ward with a population of thousands and that virtually all were white. Councillor Chapman believes that the racialisation of the CPF has to do with the different priorities of residents in the ward. Further research is required to establish the reasons for the low levels of participation of people of colour, an issue that is of concern to Captain Patrick. From his interaction with residents who do not attend CPF meetings, he found that many feel that the CPF has a strong Democratic Alliance (DA) influence and is being used to discredit the police and, by extension, undermine the African National Congress (ANC) government.
W/O Percy stressed the value of community policing and emphasised that Umbilo SAPS is ‘trying to forge new partnerships.’ He believes that a factor contributing to strained relations is that some residents in the ward have not come to terms with the change of personnel at Umbilo: ‘you have to have 80 percent of a certain group who constitute the majority at the police station but not the ward. One problem is that the police may ‘not be thinking in the way that people of the area expect them to think,’ which leads to misunderstandings. Captain Patrick also felt that racial stereotyping continues to influence residents’ behaviour. There are instances where

- a white person that comes in here is frustrated. He comes in the charge office for half an hour and says, “You know what, you can’t spell, that is why you are taking so long to write my statement.” Those are all the issues that we have to deal with…. That is where your barriers come into play.

Racial stereotyping is also evident in other studies on policing. For example, in her study of the Durban Public Order Police (POP) unit of the SAPS, Marks (2008:654) found that the unit was ‘plagued by deep racial and gender divisions’ which were due to ‘the structural make-up of the unit and the inability of middle management to challenge entrenched practices, as well as deep-seated assumptions, schemas and values associated with race, ethnicity and gender.’ Marks’ study underscores the fact that almost two decades into South Africa’s non-racial democracy, racial stereotyping continues to have currency. This includes the attitudes of police officers towards their colleagues, as well as police attitudes towards members of the public, and the stereotypes that residents hold of police. Indeed, Captain Patrick, stated that the

- undercurrent running in Umbilo needs to be understood. Nobody wanted a Black station commander here, nobody. Because when there was a white station commander the white community could walk into his office, pull a chair and tell the secretary we are waiting for the station commander. No appointment. Even use his phone if they needed to.

There are also tensions within the CPF. According to Captain Patrick, when an attempt was made to bring members from the Dalton Hostel, Kenneth Gardens, and other low income places into the CPF, members from the northern parts of the ward were reluctant to get involved. Burger also found it difficult to mobilise a neighbourhood that comprised of ‘many cultures and a socio-economic divide’ that resulted in a lack of empathy on the part of some in the ward regarding the circumstances and needs of others. She found that most members of the CPF were ‘unwilling or unable to respond to broad community concerns.’ Her aim was to involve all 'sectors of the ward’s population and not just whites.' While residents at Dalton Hostel are subjected to crime, rape, and domestic violence, they have no forum to voice their grievances, but ‘whities will stand up if their lawnmower gets nicked.’ Burger pointed out that, residents in the different parts of the ward face different “crime” problems. It was reported in February 2012, for example, that seven people, who had been using a house in Umbilo as a brothel, were arrested for alleged human trafficking. Girls as young as ten were found to be ‘sexually abused, raped, and beaten’ (Sunday Tribune, 26 February 2012). During her time in the CPF, Burger tried to integrate residents [but] failed because, in her view, ‘we have racism of epic proportions in the area.’
Burger believes that some residents and the police deliberately subverted her attempts to forge an alliance with residents of colour. She claims that the chairman of Dalton Hostel was ‘actually told you will not get involved otherwise you will have a problem.’ Burger believes that the police want to keep the local community divided as they fear that a strong CPF will ‘do something about the high levels of corruption within the police force.’ She feels that white residents, who did not directly experience police brutality under apartheid, ‘are reluctant to question police authority’ and have a tendency to accept police corruption as long as their ‘interests and perceived rights are protected.’

Burger targeted what she perceived as police corruption. This was triggered, according to her, by a ‘lot of drunken police parties in that park [Umbilo].’ In 2012, she resigned from her job to head the UAG fulltime and applied to register it as a Non-Profit Organisation (NPO). The UAG executive consisted of eight members and its focus included housing, drugs, gangsterism at school, human trafficking, domestic violence, xenophobia, and police corruption. On this point she said, ‘to be honest I fear the police more than I fear the criminals.’ Even Councillor Chapman was not very complimentary about the police:

_to be honest I don’t particularly trust the police here. They could be more proactive. I don’t think detective work is done very well; I don’t think crime prevention work is done well at all; I don’t believe there is enough visibility in hotspot areas…. Too many well known drug dealers and runners seem to operate with impunity._

There was official support for Burger’s claims. An investigation by the then Independent Complaints Directorate (now renamed the Independent Police Investigative Directorate - IPID), completed in January 2012, criticized nine police officers at Umbilo Police Station for their ‘inadequate and insensitive’ handling of cases involving victims of sex crimes. Burger told reporters that Umbilo was a ‘male-dominated station, and hopefully it [the findings] will lead to more sensitivity to the needs of women…. and how to handle cases that need sensitive handling.’ Such incidents, she said, destroyed the trust between the community and police and harmed the image of the police (_Sunday Tribune_, 15 January 2012: 9).

In February 2012, the UAG organised a public march against crime and police corruption in Umbilo. It also prepared a map identifying 30 drugs and prostitution “hotspots” in Umbilo which was submitted with a petition to police commissioner, Lieutenant-General Mkhwanazi alleging, amongst other things, that the police were dividing the community to keep the CPF ‘weak and ineffectual’; had failed to address the proliferation of drugs and prostitution; did not account to the community; endorsed gender prejudice; failed to provide transparent responses to public complaints; and fostered a culture of fear by threatening the arbitrary arrest of those who laid complaints against them (_Sunday Tribune_, 19 February 2012: 15).

Around the same time, Mary de Hass, a KZN violence monitor, wrote to Willies Mchunu, Community Safety MEC, to complain that there was a massive increase in drug dealing, violent crime, and sexual violence in the area, which was not being addressed by the Umbilo SAPS. De Haas noted that there was a ‘history of
violent crime, including rape, in the Umbilo Park area,’ and complained of the police’s ‘failure to deal with crimes and ensure patrols in the vicinity’ (Daily News, 25 April 2012).

Captain Patrick takes a different view. In his opinion, during UAG marches, ‘for every ten white people, there is half a non-white person. So when you take photographs and look at the action group having this campaign against the police you had 80 percent of the people wearing DA t-shirts there.’ He questioned whether the UAG was a “community” organisation and insisted that ‘if the members [of the SAPS] are corrupt, which some of them probably are, then that must be subjected to an investigation and we must prove what we are saying.’ Without saying as much, Captain Patrick’s comments suggest that crime and alleged police inefficiency and corruption may possibly be a manifestation of other insecurities and feelings of marginalisation among some South Africans.

While the UAG was vocal and involved via its website in a host of activities, including the country’s secrecy bill and the new port development in south Durban, it closed down in May 2013. It had organised a “Reclaim Umbilo Park” event on 11 May 2013 to eradicate criminals from the park and raise funds for the organisation. That event was cancelled and on the same day Vanessa Burger posted an announcement on the UAG’s Facebook page that it was being closed down. According to the message, the UAG’s December 2012 application to the Department of Social Development for non-profit status was delayed unnecessarily and this made it impossible to continue operating. Notwithstanding this, the decision appeared to be very sudden (Daily News, 15 May 2013). In a subsequent telephonic discussion (1 July 2013), Burger said that in addition to financial constraints, political and criminal interference, which she sees as linked, were crucial in the closure of the UAG. She feels that the authorities were determined to stamp out her anti-corruption drive. She points out that, the night before the Umbilo Park Rally, the police raided the Dalton Hostel, knowing that residents of the hostel and its musical group were to perform at the rally.

The closure of the UAG may be connected to changes in the Umbilo CPF, where the situation is fluid. At a meeting on 4 April 2013, the Umbilo Precinct (Bulwer, Carrington Heights, Congella, Glenwood, Glenmore, Umbilo, the University) was divided into eight wards6 and an Interim Umbilo CPF was elected for a period of three months. It was mandated to form Sub-Forums in the areas; ‘motivate communities to participate in the Safety Structures’; align the UCPF constitution with the Provincial Board Constitution; and work with the Umbilo SAPS to invite stakeholders to the relaunch of the Umbilo CPF. The chair/convenor of the Interim Committee was Ben Madokwe and the secretary, Naomi Stehouwer. The CFP thus came to include economically depressed areas such as the Dalton Hostel, Kenneth Gardens, and Flamingo Court.7 According to several informants, one of the problems is the difficulties confronting working class members

---

6 Despite several attempts, I was unable to get a map of the new division of the ward.

7 The full Interim Committee is Area 1 (Lower Bulwer): Louis Stehouwer, Heather Rorick; Area 2 (Bulwer): Dawn Rabie, Jabu, and Rob Hackenbruch; Areas 3 (Glenwood): Tony Blaunfeldt, Marese Hamann; Area 4 (Glenmore): Michelle Murphy, Zim Nondino; Area 5 (Umbilo): Ben Madokwe, Nospho, Ingwe; Area 6 (Flamingo Court) Captain David Hastibeer, Jabu Ngcobo; Area 7 (Dalton Hostel): Sifiso Zwane (Major); Area 8 (Kenneth Gardens): Emanuell Madlala, Buisisiwe Ngema, Gregory Simpson. Madokwe was elected chairman of the UCPF at the end of July 2013.
of the CPF due to work and home commitments, tiredness, or the costs involved in remaining active in the CPF.

One of the first acts of the Interim UCPF was to organise a Crime Summit on 29 June 2013 at the Nelson Mandela Medical School. The theme of the Summit was "Mpimpa izigebengu campaign ('Blow the whistle against perpetrators of crime in our area')" and its two key concerns were to investigate ways in which the community can assist to make the precinct crime-free and ways in which the relationship between the community and the SAPS can be improved. Participants included the HOD Community, Safety & Liaison Office (KZN), Brig. Sayer (Cluster Commander) of the Umbilo SAPS, ADT Security and Blue Security, Umbilo Business Forum, and Umbilo Churches in Community. Following presentations from various stakeholders, a number of resolutions were passed. These included forming neighbourhood watches and street committees, mobilising communities to work with the police in the fight against crime, urging residents to be vigilant in reporting crime and following-up on the outcomes, widening the struggle against crime to include universities, schools, churches, and businesses, and securing residents’ buy in to three key principles: ‘be committed to the community we serve’; ‘respect each other at all times’, and ‘take ownership of community policing’.

At the UCPF elections on 30 July 2014, Madokwe was elected chairperson. In his acceptance speech he said that no police force can be effective without the assistance of the public and he pledged to build trust and strengthen the partnership between the Umbilo SAPS and the local community as well as with ‘church leaders, businesses, and security companies’ (Berea Mail, 9 August 2013: 4).

The Crime Summit and developments at the UCPF show that there are civic groups who are responding to crime and the fear of crime in the ward.

**SUMMARY**

Residents of Ward 33 are responding in different ways to crime and the fear of crime. Some have left the ward entirely, while the relationship of others to public spaces has changed fundamentally. Some residents are engaged in various forms of civic action to remedy the problems that they identify in the neighbourhood. One theme that emerged strongly during the interviews is the increasing demographic diversity of the ward as a result of the large population turnover over the past two decades. If one accepts the argument of Robert Putnam, then it may be said that diversity has adverse implications for social capital (‘social ties between community members who support each other and sanction deviance’) and hence social cohesion in the ward, which, in turn, may impact on residents’ responses to crime and the fear of crime.

One consequence may be “hunkering down” on the part of older residents. Scheepers, Schmeets and Pelzer (2013: 104) propose that ‘people who perceive ethnic minorities or poor people to threaten or devalue their status and habits may become discomforted more generally and hunker down.’ This may explain the behaviour of those who are shunning civic involvement in neighbourhood associations.
Differences of race and nationality in particular, which run through many of the narratives, are used by interviewees to explain the lack of social cohesion in the neighbourhood. And discourses of race, nationality, and crime mingle with one another. There is a circular argument. Fear of crime, it appears from these narratives, has increased racist and xenophobic tendencies, which, in turn, has decreased the possibility of social cohesion in ‘mixed’ communities, which in turn makes these communities more vulnerable to crime than those which have high levels of social cohesion, and this in turn may reinforce racist and xenophobic sentiments.

Portes and Vickstrom (2011: 464) contest Putnam’s thesis. They question whether social capital, defined as ‘communitarianism and generalized trust’, is ‘the powerful causal force that Putnam alleges it to be.’ They also question whether ‘this form of social capital is the main basis for cohesion in modern society.’ Their analysis of a number of studies internationally found only qualified support for Putnam’s hypothesis, and led them to conclude that there is no linear negative relationship between diversity and social capital. Social capital, they argue, is not an independent variable but a result of structural factors such as education, economic equality, and racial segregation.

In her study of Britain, Letki (2008: 120) concludes that ‘there is only very limited empirical confirmation for the argument that racial diversity erodes social cohesion and destroys relations in local communities.’ Letki points to a relationship ‘between solidarity, diversity and poverty. Solidarity is undermined by poverty, but the blame [by government] is placed on diversity, as a result of the fact that diversity and poverty are strongly associated’ (2008:121). According to Letki (2008: 122), community cohesion cannot be created in a context of deprivation and inequality. Thus, the efforts of the British government ‘to de-emphasise socio-economic deprivation and focus on stimulating intercommunity relationships and creating “unity from diversity” have been rather misplaced, as deprivation is the major factor eroding community relations and negatively tinting diversity’ (Letki, 2008: 124). This suggests that the need for social and economic equality is greater than cultural, ethnic, or racial unity to achieve workable local communities. There is gross economic inequality in Ward 33 and this has negative implications for a cohesive ward.

It is worth noting that while there may have been a decline in participation in some kinds of civic activities (such as sporting clubs) in the ward, this does not necessarily mean a decline in social capital since civic innovation is taking place in other arenas, with neighbourhood watches, business forums, the UAG, and the Bulwer Park project (which is a form of civic environmentalism) being good examples. These provide a basis from which civic action can mushroom. While this is in its infancy, it is encouraging that the new forms of civic action are crossing racial, cultural, class, and ethnic boundaries, and that they involve linkages with the business sector, and police and municipal officials. Residents are adopting innovative ways to rally community assets to address neighbourhood problems and the ways this is happening may also be qualitatively richer.
Chapter Six, which follows, and which constitutes the “heart” of this dissertation, focuses on another response to crime and the fear of crime: physical security and building design, in particular walls and boundary markers.

CHAPTER SIX: WALLS AS A RESPONSE TO CRIME & THE FEAR OF CRIME

If apartheid used spatial distance and cultural walls as separators of populations, the post-apartheid city is increasingly defined by actual physical walls…. Walls tend to produce their own ostensible cause, fear and separation, as well as a sense of loss of the innocence and carefree life that preceded them. Today the melancholia of freedom sits in the walls, which are commonly seen as sadly necessary and also as manifestations of a lost form of social life. Many of South Africa’s walls are indeed melancholic walls.

- Thomas Blom Hansen (2012: 292-93)

Crime and the fear of crime have made many residents of Ward 33 anxious about their security. As noted in chapters four and five, residents have responded to this fear by adopting preventative measures such as keeping dogs, installing high-tech alarm systems that are linked to private security companies, carrying panic buttons, resorting to social control (like walking around the neighbourhood to seek out potential suspects), moving into gated communities, or engaging in various forms of civic action to remedy the problems in their neighbourhoods. Multiple measures are adopted incrementally in response to a certain event or events.

This chapter focuses on the attitudes of residents of Ward 33 towards physical target-hardening measures such as firming up home facades or property boundaries through security gates (often electronic) in front of driveways and doors, and high boundary walls or fences around the property. Thomas Blom Hansen, a Dutch-based anthropologist who spent several years in South Africa and lived in the township of Chatsworth, about which he wrote a book, suggests above that the adoption of such measures is becoming ubiquitous across South Africa and that this is a reflection of the anxiety that freedom has generated among many citizens. He describes these walls as ‘melancholic’ because, in his understanding, many people are experiencing a sense of loss in the post-apartheid period without being able to clearly identify exactly what they have lost. What, in fact, has been lost, according to Hansen, is, ironically, the “security” of apartheid enforced segregation. Since nostalgic memories of a past life in racial enclaves cannot be formally acknowledged, the experience of freedom becomes ‘melancholic’.

The theme of being overrun by the “hordes” from the outside has long been a theme in fiction by white South African authors, including the work of two of the country’s Nobel Prize for Literature winners, Nadime Gordimer and J.M. Coetzee. Gordimer’s Something Out There (1984) focuses on a quiet white suburb that is terrified by the threat posed by a large, unidentified ape-like animal that some residents have seen and fear will break into their homes. This is symbolic of the threat posed by the country’s majority population; in fact, speculation about the animal’s species centres on several possibilities: baboon, monkey, or a black
The title of J.M. Coetzee’s *Waiting for the Barbarians* (1980) speaks to the existence of opposites as one group defines itself against an opposite, white against black, cold against hot, the civilised against the barbarians. Borders (read walls) are defended as they help to maintain the dichotomy between “them” and us” (O’ Dea, 2004: 3).

In *Disgrace* (1999), Coetzee examines white fears of black people in post-apartheid South Africa. The rape of the daughter of one of the main protagonists in the novel, David Lurie, by three black men, the vandalisation of his Cape Town home, and the desire of a black character, Petrus, to lay his hands on “white wealth” seem to reinforce the fears of many whites about nationalisation, land reform, and crime. Coetzee has been accused of ‘racism, of feeding national hysteria, and of reflecting white anxieties in the post-apartheid context’ (Graham, 2003). But as Gordimer’s *The House Gun* (1999) suggests, the irony is that the threat is sometimes as much from within the heavily fortified fortresses as from without. Her novel is about a young white man who kills his housemate with “the house gun”.

While walls around individual homes may indeed be melancholic and a reflection of deeper insecurities, they also appear in many instances to be a direct response to crime and the fear of crime. A key question in this chapter is: how does residents’ fear of crime or lack thereof, correlate with attitudes towards and the creation of real walls?

Chapter two pointed to the growing interest in using the built environment to reduce incidents, and hence possibly fear, of crime (CPTED). Rather than fortress-like neighbourhoods, natural surveillance, natural access control, and natural territorial reinforcement can assist to reduce crime. In light of this, how do residents view boundary security walls? This chapter is based on discussions with respondents about their choice of home boundaries, using photographs that are representative of various types of ‘walls’ in the neighbourhood as a tool to elicit responses and to interrogate the effectiveness of CPTED principles.

A noticeable feature of Ward 33 is the absence of gated neighbourhoods through road closures, which is a feature of life in many affluent parts of the country. This is due to the fact that the local government in Durban band road closures (Lemanski, Landman and Durington, 2008). Residents in Ward 33 indicated that the layout of the streets and the high volume of traffic passing through the area make this impossible, even though some expressed a wish to do so.

The first part of this chapter examines some of the theoretical considerations around the issue of walls as a reaction to fear of crime.

**REACTION TO CRIME/FEAR OF CRIME: WALLS, FENCES & GATED COMMUNITIES**

The practice of exclusion (outsiders) and inclusion (insiders) has a long genealogy. Historically, social relations were localised which meant that criminals and other groups were treated as outsiders. Xenophobia, which plagues many contemporary societies, is not a new phenomenon. Bengez (2009)
points out that medieval Europe was beset by anxiety about strangers, and that governments and citizens responded by building walls around their communities and homes to keep out unwanted individuals. This has been repeated in many societies over the centuries. This keeping out of strangers is ubiquitous in present-day (middle class) South Africa, where living behind walls and within gated communities is becoming the norm for many, particularly affluent, people (Bezuidenhout, 2011: 6).

The building of walls – literally and figuratively - as a strategy to reduce crime and the fear of it, has been relatively under-researched in South Africa. Studies have, however, been conducted on the closure of public roads and the creation of gated communities in middle class South African suburbs as a reaction to crime and the fear of crime. Check points have been built on many public thoroughfares to monitor movement through residential centres. The efficacy of these strategies in reducing or preventing crime in the South African context has been questioned because a high number of crimes are committed by known persons (Landman & Schonteich, 2002). Vilalta (2012) points out in his study of Mexico City that once criminals enter a closed estate or building, the opportunity for 'doing crime' is increased. Vilalta also noted that home security systems such as walls, reinforced windows, burglar bars, and other such measures were ‘expensive and inefficient’ as they had little impact on residents’ fear of crime.

In the South African context, Ballard has done innovative work on middle class (mostly white) residents in South Africa who are taking ‘refuge’ in gated communities. According to Ballard, gated communities are an attempt to maintain ‘Western’ and ‘First World’ living standards. Ballard has termed the move to gated communities ‘semigration’, which he distinguishes from emigration in that residents are not giving up their country but their citizenship by shutting themselves off in gated communities with security apparatus such as boom gates, high walls, razor wire electric fences, and armed response security companies (Ballard, 2004a, 2004b, 2005). Ballard (2005: 17-22) refers to gated communities as ‘privatised apartheid’. He argues that in the absence of state backing in the post-apartheid period, ‘the prospect of racial and class mixing going unmanaged by the state is leading many to resolve the problem with their private resources.’ The movement into gated communities has resulted ‘in a kind of hybrid of emigration, secession and segregation’ in which the residents live in South Africa but want to avoid having too much to do with it.

Gated communities are not unique to South Africa. The USA has experienced ‘white flight’ from its cities since the 1960s in the context of increased civil rights protests and concern about urban chaos and disorder. Mike Davis notes that Americans have been withdrawing into enclaves such as gated estates, buildings with doormen, and other such features that isolate people from outside threats. Davis refers to this phenomenon as “privatopias” (1998). Gated communities are a means to keep out the “other”. As Kempa and Singh (2008: 343-344) point out,

> The movement and livelihoods of ‘others’ [Black African South Africans, foreigners] in these spaces is determined by utterly unaccountable authorities. Taxis, buses and other public transportation vehicles that ferry in workers from the nearby townships are often not permitted into enclosed neighborhoods despite the fact that the roads remain public. Dropped off outside, workers must walk to their
workplace—sometimes for several kilometers to find an alternate access point if pedestrian gates are closed. Without access cards (issued by the security companies themselves!), workers must register their personal details with private security guards and wait for clearance from their employers before they are permitted entry.

Durington has also argued that race and class segregation has increased in the post-apartheid period, as the migration of large numbers of Africans into cities is accompanied by the flight of capital and the middle classes out of cities, often into gated communities which, according to Durington (2006: 148),

are perceived to be symbolic cultural bastions and safe havens from crime and other social ills affecting social spaces outside of their confines. In turn, their construction also supports the growth of a fear industry made up of armed security companies and others that create and maintain security apparatuses supporting a general “culture of fear”.

Durington concludes from his ethnographic study of gated communities in Durban that most residents of such communities are ‘constantly anxious about what could happen in the outside world’, which is increasingly populated by Blacks and even foreigners (Durington, 2006: 153). Landman’s (2004) study of four gated communities in Gauteng, South Africa found that the impact of enclosing the neighbourhood to prevent crime was ‘experienced as positive and beneficial. The increased feeling of safety is also reflected in the difference in usage patterns of residents – for example using the street, allowing children to walk to their friends, etc.’

Fear of crime and the resulting choices that people make is impacting on the shape of the post-apartheid city. The planner-centric systems theory views planning as a general societal management process (Allmendinger, 2009), and incorporates the idea that technical solutions facilitate societal progress (Connell, 2010). The apartheid regime used planning to shape South African society in racially segregated ways. While apartheid produced artificially segregated urban development, fear of crime is also shaping a segregated urban space in the post-apartheid period (Spinks, 2001: 3). Lemanski’s study of two communities in Cape Town affirms this. Silvertree residents sought refuge in the physical security of a gated community, while residents of Muizenburg (which was flooded by immigrants and “gangsters”) created an ‘Improvement District’ to ‘upgrade’ their residential area. Poor (mainly Black African immigrants) residents were evicted or forced to move as they could not afford higher rentals. In both cases, certain classes of individuals, and with them crime, were transferred to socio-economically weaker areas. This resulted in the creation of exclusionary spaces that were contrary to the post-apartheid drive for desegregation (Lemanski, 2006).

There is an irony in this as security threats often rest within what people consider to be safe zones. In April 2012, for example, three grade 11 schoolboys who attended an elite school in Durban North were arrested for stealing R2.4 million worth of goods from houses in the upmarket Mount Edgecombe Golf Estate. A police spokesman explained the modus operandi of these school boys in the local press:
The gang leader lived on the estate with his family. Two of his friends, who are from Durban North and Glenashley, went to visit the boy at the estate. While there, they decided to play a prank and go into one of the houses and get something to eat. This is a gated, well-secured estate and many of the homes have easy access. In daylight, the boys allegedly entered the house of a wealthy businessman, which was apparently unlocked, and raided the kitchen. They then picked on homes where the owners were away on holiday. They would knock on the door, and if someone answered, they would pretend to be looking for their friends (The Daily News, 24 April 2012).

Who we fear may not necessarily be who should be feared. Although there is evidence that crime is higher in townhouse complexes and flats than in freehold houses, and Landman (2004) makes the point that even in gated communities crime is ‘not completely reduced, both crime and the fear of crime were … perceived to be reduced.’ In other words, notwithstanding the reality that these fortresses can be breached, these secure complexes appear to provide a sense of psychological security.

WALLS AS A SOURCE OF SECURITY

One thread running through the respondents’ narratives was that the control of space is crucial to prevent crime as well as for physical safety. A range of security measures, including and especially the construction of walls, are being implemented in Ward 33. Chantal noted the irony that in the past the “criminal” element in society was locked behind walls in order that society would feel safe; now people are voluntarily locking themselves up to keep away from “criminals”. In speaking to respondents it became clear that those who expressed higher levels of fear of crime (as discussed in chapter four) tended to speak more strongly in favour of walls as a defensive measure.

Michael noted that in Ward 33, as a result of a perceived increase in robberies, walls have sprung up over the past few decades:

I worked on the census for the government in 1980. There were no high fences or gates, there were just little gates and you’d go up and knock on the doors and I did it [census] at night time in this area, nobody questioned, they just sit and gave all the answers. This last one (2011), I would hate to have been a census taker because first thing is you’ve got big gates, you ring the intercom and they look out the windows and, “I’m not going out there”.

Most respondents felt that walls provided a sense of security, though some expressed reservations. Chantal has lived in a secure complex close to the Glenwood Buxtons Shopping Centre since the mid-1990s and has noticed the incremental addition of security measures in response to perceived and actual increases in crime. Looking at the photograph of the block in which she lives, she said, ‘First, gates were put around the block – security gates, a wooden fence, electric wires above the fence, and then electric
fencing.' Residents also carry "panic buttons" connected to a private security company. Despite security around the complex, Chantal put additional security in her own apartment when she became a "victim" of crime. Her experience also points to the psychological scars of being a victim of crime. A robbery away from her home resulted in her reinforcing security at her residence:

*I've installed huge burglar bars – very dense, enormous, fitted-into-the-wall burglar bars – in my kitchen window which faces onto the open common verandahs, and I also put huge burglar bars in the bedroom and in the two bathroom windows. The reason I did that had nothing to do with anything in the neighbourhood. I was at a robot, my car window was broken and my bag snatched. That gave me a sort of mania. I kept imagining that the guy who'd done it, because he would obviously know my address, was going to leap through my kitchen window. I just really couldn't bear this window and I also had, at about the same time, Trellidors put on the two verandah doors and the front door.*

![Chantal's residence](image)

**Figure 32: Chantal's residence**

*Source: Author, 2013*

Amy was another respondent who could not imagine life without walls, even though she felt that some of the walls in her neighbourhood were not aesthetically appealing and that having walled houses reduced the aesthetic appeal of the neighbourhood as a whole. When shown photographs of homes without walls or with fences, she rejected CPTED principles and took it as axiomatic that walls provide safety and security. She felt that not enclosing one’s property was an invitation to criminal activity:

*If you have nothing it’s a chance for them [thieves] to get in. With the walls for security, who is not going to want to be safe? Across here also once, this happened a little while ago. There were two guys out here and two guys who jumped over. They were passing the garden furniture over the wall. The next day they put an electric fence. But you see the moment they walk past if they get a chance they are going to get in. Once also, their door was slightly open, this fellow got in. If there is an opportunity they are not going to leave it. So, you know, you think, if you are going to put these barbed wires and whatever, it’s like you are living in a prison, it is going to look ugly, but I feel rather that.*
Figure 33: Amy’s home and wall
Source: Author, 2013

Amy felt that properties without walls encourage opportunistic crime. She retains faith in walls despite the fact that her neighbour was robbed when thieves climbed over the wall; they then added an electric fence. Walls, she emphasised, provide her with psychological comfort.

Mary, who had a break-in at her home in mid-2012, described how she increased security in her home in response to this experience:

_We have got a fence, electric gates. We have barbed wire down the one side of our house. We have got alarms inside the house. We have got sensors on our back, after this three months ago thing [robbery], we have got a sensor on our back deck, an outside sensor. And we [are] actually debating whether to put electric fencing as we speak since that incident happened. Well its, 20 years ago, 25 years ago there was no industry, it’s just an industry [security] that has come out of nothing. So we have got a sophisticated home security system, we keep upgrading it. After the last [robbery], we got more sensors inside, we got an outside sensor. It drives me insane, I hate it but there is nothing that I can do about it. Every time something happens we just buy more and dah, dah, dah._

Mary’s point about the phenomenal growth of the security industry is well taken. There are an estimated 9 000 private security companies and more than 400 000 registered active private security guards in South Africa. This is more than the combined personnel of the South African police and army (Eastwood, 2013). According to official SAPS statistics, between 2003 and 2012, the murder rate in the country dropped by 28 percent, attempted murder by 55 percent, and assault by 32 percent. Yet, in the period 2001 to 2012, the number of private security officers in South Africa doubled to 412 000 while the SAPS had just 194 000 paid employees in 2011 (See Appendix J for a graphic representation of this growth; in Cox 2012).

Chantal, Ms MK and Mary’s stories point to the incremental increase in physical security in response to crime. Shown homes in the ward without walls, Mary cannot imagine living in a neighbourhood where CPTED principles were applied: ‘Oh God, I would have a fit [without walls]. To the point of the fact that if by mistake we leave the gate open, our neighbour will phone us or we will phone him and say do you know
your gates opened. And shoe-joe we close it, ja.’ Even with a gate, Mary has been deeply scarred by the break-in: ‘with my husband [I feel] absolutely safe. But on my own I am feeling vulnerable.’ Like Mary, Chantal felt that walls provide a ‘sort of comfort in knowing that I’m not going to open my door and find somebody there whom I don’t know….It offers a slight sort of peace of mind.’

Following an attempted robbery at her home, Louis added an electric fence to her wall and is angry at having to subsidise a state function:

_We had, beginning of last year, people hopping the walls from our neighbour. You must see how they climb that wall….. We got home one day and we thought, why on earth are all our [garden] chairs stacked up here? We realised they stacked the chairs up to take them away and they couldn’t because they are quite heavy. So now we put up electric fencing all around. I think it’s shocking that we have got to spend all this money on safeguarding our homes when the government is doing absolutely nothing to keep us safe._

![Figure 34: Naomi’s backyard; Electric fencing was added to the existing security (wall)
Source: Author, 2013](image)

Naomi found that walls and electric fencing were inadequate and installed roboguards⁸ on the balcony. As she explained, ‘you put it on at night, but John [her husband] will sleep through a hurricane though I would be the one protecting him [laughs]. If anyone crosses the beams, the alarm goes off.’

---

⁸ Roboguards are wireless outdoor intruder security alarm systems that use passive infrared sensor beams to detect movement with a specified distance and arc.
There is a correlation between fear of crime and the decision to build walls. As chapter four shows, Chantal, Ms MK, Naomi, and Mary all expressed high levels of fear of crime. Amy was ‘paranoid’ about crime; Mary associated crime with blackness and wanted a clampdown on foreigners; Chantal spoke of ‘paranoia’ about crime; and Naomi wished she was living further north in the ward because of the crime, grime, foreigners, and students in her immediate vicinity. This fear is behind the decision to increase security and live behind solid walls. That most of these respondents are better-off financially means that they can have the kind of security they desire.

One of the issues that emerged about walls as an instrument of security was their aesthetics. Some respondents felt that walls should be seen as ornamental elements of the neighbourhood rather than as mere defensive structures. Mary regarded walls as a ‘necessary evil’ and described some walls in the neighbourhood as ‘horrific, ugly.’ Even walking in the neighbourhood has become ‘horrible, it’s walls on either side.’ Chantal felt that some of the walls are ‘spoiling’ the neighbourhood. While some residents installed ‘the most beautiful burglar bars which look almost like stained glass window designs and the burglar bars are right up against the window so it in fact looks as if it is pieces of glass in the burglar bars,’ most residents ‘don’t have the resources to do that and so, very often, it’s really ugly because they want security.’ Michael was another who felt that many of the walls spoilt the appearance of the area. ‘Some roads, when you pass, it’s just like big walls – like a canyon of walls.’ Susan was also concerned about aesthetics: ‘They can look awful, sometimes they look dreadful – the walls – especially when people don’t paint it.’

However, these respondents do not believe that restrictions should be placed on the building of walls. For example, Chantel was adamant that ‘if people don’t feel safe, they should be able to put up security, I mean, within reason, you know, I would absolutely hate it if somebody bought a huge piece of corrugated iron and hammered it.’

The residents of Ward 33 who show strong faith in walls as a means of protection tend to live in the upper part of Ward 33 (Glenwood area). Walls are contributing to the social divide in the country generally as those who can afford them are increasingly privatising their lives by cutting themselves off from those
outside their "enclosures", in the process creating new forms of social distinction. The narratives also show that the walls make the residents feel safer even though crime incidents occur despite the walls, a trend also reported elsewhere (such as Landman, 2004).

**WHY WALLS DON’T WORK**

Interviewees, including those with walls around their homes, felt that walls are ineffective in deterring criminals determined to commit a crime; that walls may actually encourage criminals who want to know what is on the other side of the wall; and that walls pose a danger to residents because neighbours have no idea what is happening on the inside.

Michael is a firm proponent of CPTED. He relies on ‘burglar alarms’ for security ‘up to a point, you know, you feel safe [but] you’re obviously careful.’ In addition, ‘we’ve got a good Neighbourhood Watch up there in Carrington Heights, Glenmore. They patrol the streets by night. We have Blue Security that patrol during the day – we pay for that.’ Discussing the photographs of the various kinds of walls, Michael expressed skepticism about walls because of the lack of visibility from the outside. He has a ‘little low pre-cast fence with a hedge above it, lots of lights [seven] on at night. You can see out, you know, it makes a big difference. And you can see who’s at the gate.’ On the other hand, ‘if you have high walls, once the person’s over it, you can’t see what’s happening from the road.’

![Figure 37: Michael’s residence](source: Author, 2013)

Michael related the example of a neighbour with a high wall and alarm that ‘keeps going off. They’re not there, It’s “oh, there it goes again.” I’m not going to worry, people don’t know what’s happening over there.’ On the other hand, those with low walls tend to ‘look after each other’s properties, see each other, what’s happening, and speak to each other and say to the neighbour, “I’m going away for a week, clear my postbox and my black [bin] bags, walk around the yard.” Just recently, I went and fed their dog while they were away.’ Michael also believes that walls encourage criminal activity: ‘perhaps the burglar thinks, they’ve got a lot to hide so let’s go there and see what they’ve got, “oh, I wonder what’s on the other side of the wall, let’s have a look,” you know.’ He also believes that walls are not a deterrent because most criminals are familiar with the property. He cited one anecdote:

> You go along Fielden Drive and there are some houses you can see in and others you can’t. Our neighbours on both sides of us have got high walls, about two metres, so you can’t see what’s
happening. The house next door to us was vacant for five months, nothing happened. But then the plumber came and did some work on this vacant house and two weeks later all the copper piping was stolen... Another neighbour down the road thinks that the security company’s got something to do with it because they had a new burglar alarm put in, the next night their’s was cut, so they said it was in the ceiling and nobody would know it was there, except the workers or they have told their friends where to go.

Other respondents pointed to criminals being known to their domestic assistants or in fact being former domestic assistants. In such cases, walls assist criminals because they know what is on the other side and once they get over, they are not visible.

Amy, who ‘cannot imagine life without walls,’ conceded that ‘a lot of them [criminals] can jump over, you know, then how high do you make it?’ She regarded a very high wall as counter-productive because ‘you must also see what is happening [or] if somebody is in, nobody will know that something is happening in the house or around.’ Chantal regarded it as ‘quite dangerous to have high walls that you can’t see through in the front of your house for example.’ She prefers fences: ‘My brother has quite high fences which you can see right through. I think that’s much safer than having walls.’

Shown photographs of some of the high walls in the neighbourhhood, and asked how secure she would feel within them, Susan was not convinced about their effectiveness in keeping out criminals who, she points out, can get around most physical barriers:

Some people have got the barbed wire and all the rest of it. In my own opinion it doesn't matter where you are, if they want to get in, they’ll get in whether you’ve got a fence or not. At Carrie’s [Carrington Heights] what they’ve been doing – you know how the people have big gates? - they’ve been actually smashing the cars through the gates and getting into the house and, doing all this in the five minutes before the security company actually gets there. I’ve got these Trellidor things at home. I think they are no problem to them at all, quite honestly, people still break in when there’s walls and there’s security systems.
Susan also noted that in many instances criminals were let in by people known to them. She also provided an interesting anecdote about cultural attitudes towards seclusion and privacy:

*When I was staying in Hillary, it was when the Group Areas Act was like [being] dissolved [and] a lot of the residents from Chatsworth started to move into the Hillary area and we had, you know, next to us we didn’t have a fence up, but the lady who was staying was an Indian lady from Chatsworth, and she’s just started to cut trees down. Now I love trees, I love a garden full of trees, and then she started to complain about our trees and she just wanted to cut all the trees down. So, unfortunately there was altercations about that. I said, we love our trees, now you want to cut down our trees. Oh no, she said, but in Chatsworth we didn’t have all these trees because we could look into each other’s gardens and see each other and then we felt safer. And it was only then that we understood why this woman was cutting down trees. They felt that their gardens must be open, look into each other’s kitchens and look into each other’s yards – to them no privacy was security, to us trees were privacy – it’s like a fence, you know, closing yourself off.*

Without theorising it as such, Susan’s neighbour seemed to embrace the CPTED principle of visibility. Several other respondents also noted that when Indian people purchase a property they tend to cut down trees and foliage. While this is interpreted in various ways, ranging from a dislike of greenery on the part of Indians to an aversion to gardening it may well be argued that for some who choose to cut down their trees, being observable to others has advantages. This is very evident in Chatsworth, for example, where most homes are bounded by low fences and neighbours conversing over the fence are a common sight.

Vanessa Burger, who lives opposite the Umbilo Park, said that the idea that walls provide security ‘is just a mental perception. I don’t think it helps one bit. If they want to come in they will.’ On the contrary, walls ‘create barriers between your neighbours. It breaks down communication. It breaks down the whole feeling of a community and of a neighbourhood altogether.’ She described some of the walls in the ward as...
‘aesthetically shocking, you know, rolls of razor wire and all the rest around some peoples’ places. It looks terrible.’ Yet Burger will retain her walls but not for security reasons:

*Personally, I like my privacy so I wouldn’t [remove the walls]. I have got an indigenous garden which is full of massive trees and huge bushes and everything, so I would hate people to see into my garden and passers-by and people from the park and that, I would hate it. I would not like the property to be fairly accessible to people walking past.*

For Burger, walls are a way of ensuring privacy, not safety. She is very active in various civic groups, particularly those representing poorer residents who are struggling to eradicate crime in the neighbourhood. Her views show that people have different motivations for erecting boundaries around their homes.

One resident of Ward 33 willing to “put his money where his mouth is” was local DA Councillor Warwick Chapman, who insisted that he does not feel ‘safer behind walls’. Chapman, who was deployed by his party to Cape Town at the end of June 2013, said that he had given the issue of safety and walls a great deal of thought and discussed it at community safety meetings and with police officers. He tore down the two metre high wall around his home and ensured that the landscaping does not create hiding spaces and that lighting is adequate to make the area around the house visible. Visibility is important to Chapman ‘because if something is happening inside, people from outside can see. Something, equally, is happening outside, people inside can see, that enhances security.’ On the other hand, walls increase one’s chances of being a victim of criminal activity:

*Building our own little castles might protect us in some of the cases but in other cases, you have another problem because from the moment the crime starts taking place to the moment that somebody knows about it becomes a much longer period, and from the moment that someone gets to a property to the moment they can get inside to help you is also extended because now the same barriers that the criminals managed to traverse, you have to get in and help.*

*Figure 39: Councillor Chapman’s residence*
*Source: Author, 2013*
While common sense suggests that a house without walls is more vulnerable to criminal activity, Chapman believes that the opposite is true:

_If you are a burglar and you go through a car park and you have got a car with a gear lock and a steering wheel lock and an immobilizer, and then you have got a car next to it with nothing. Which one are you going to go for? But the [difference is that] the car thief is looking for a car he can get into and drive away quickly, a burglar is looking for some time to go through and get the stuff he wants. Now, if you have got no walls, do you have time because people could be seeing you from anywhere? Whereas if you are one of these properties with the massive high wall around it, you have got pretty much all the time you want especially if no-one is at home…. Also, I think that sort of superstitions kick into play. It’s the fear of the unknown. Why would this place be unguarded like this? Is the guy sitting on the other side of the stoop with a big shotgun or something?_

Ashley also emphasised that visibility is key to preventing crime, especially opportunistic crime, because neighbours and passers-by provide additional protection. She observed with some irony: ‘[Other houses] put up these electric fences and barbed wire. Well, that house over here in the corner – he put up barbed wire and got broken into twice [laughs].’ Ashley ‘prefer[s] to see out, see what’s going on outside’

_My neighbour, I know she goes out to work. The boys – one’s in high school, one’s in varsity – so I keep [a watch]. Somebody can’t get in there – but, if anybody does, my dogs bark then I go and look and see why my dogs are barking and what’s going on next door…. [Pointing to another neighbour] Now this lady works and, if she’s home during the day and she drives into her yard, my dogs bark but she can come home weekends and the dogs don’t worry about that. They know she’s not there in the daytime. Anybody goes in the yard, they bark, then we check to see why. She doesn’t have any security [walls / fences] but they’ve got an alarm._

Pointing to another neighbour, Ashley noted that he does not have ‘gates on his property [yet] nobody ever goes in there.’ Ashley provided an anecdote that confirmed for her that it is safer not to have walls: ‘That house on the corner there, a couple of times on a Sunday afternoon, we saw them trying to break into his house. The man across the way from him can see from his lounge, I can see from my lounge if anybody’s at his windows and we saw them at the window. He came out and called my nephew and they both went over there.’ In this way, she believes, a robbery was averted. Ashley believes that criminals associate higher walls with affluence: ‘they look at your house and think, well, they don’t have much there, we’ll leave them alone. I think the higher the walls, the more they think you’ve got to take’.

_Figure 40: Ashley’s home and a few of her neighbours, Bartle Road (Umbilo)_
_Source: Author, 2013_
Ashley’s reason for not having a wall is that she ‘prefer[s] to see out. I like to see what’s going on outside.’ Visibility is the reason why Ashley is against building security walls.

There appears to be a relationship between lower levels of fear of crime and acceptance of living without walls. As chapter four shows, Ashley and Susan are feisty and brave women who, within reason, attempt to live “normal” lives. Some respondents and Councillor Chapman is an obvious exception as he is driven by principle, are less well-off and cannot afford high walls and other security measures. It is unclear whether lower levels of fear of crime are the reason for them not having much faith in walls, or whether the fact that they do not have walls allows them to be part of their neighborhood and this helps to lower their fear of crime.

**WALLS AS INSTRUMENTS OF A SOCIAL DIVIDE**

One of the interesting points to emerge from the interviews is the role of these physical barriers (walls) in separating the population socially and physically. Some of the walls around homes in the neighbourhood bring to mind the walls around *favelas* (informal settlements) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, the Israeli wall in Palestine, and the wall along the US-Mexican border which attempt to “control” perceived problems through physical barriers. Such barriers may temporarily “hide” problems but will not necessarily resolve them. In fact, they may well deepen the divide in the long term. This was emphasised by Councillor Chapman:

> *The psychological impact [of walls] on the community is worse because I don’t know those neighbours [pointing to a neighbouring house], I have never spoken to them, I have tried to communicate with them in the driveway, but they are not interested. But if you have no wall, no physical blockage between you and your neighbour, you are forced to interact and that sense of neighbourliness is hugely crucial to community safety. Knowing who is where and interacting with them is really, really important. If something was happening there while they are away I wouldn’t know who to phone. And I really should go and bang on their door and say, “guys, we should know who we are.” The day I was moving in here these guys [pointing to another house] said “howzit” and we exchanged numbers. They are not my buddies, we don’t necessarily get on but if something happens on their side I phone them, and if something happens on my side they phone me. So I think walls are very detrimental to community safety and psychology of communities, if there is such a thing.)*

Like Chantel, Councillor Chapman favours fences over high walls:

> *If you look there [neighbouring high wall], something could happen and I wouldn’t be able to see. But these guys have a low wall at this section over there and I can lean over the wall and have a chat with them. And I do. It’s usually not a social chat but the fact of the matter is we are able to interact. Whereas those guys have probably sealed themselves off and if anything happens…not only do I not know but I can’t just jump over and try and help.*
Councillor Chapman’s statement bring to mind Robert Frosts’ poem ‘Mending Wall’ which ends with the iconic line, ‘Good fences make good neighbors’. The poem is about two neighbours who meet annually to repair the stone wall that divides their properties. The point, also made by Councillor Chapman, is that neighbours should maintain their individuality but communicate periodically and look out for each other. In the poem, the neighbours’ annual meeting is an opportunity to develop their relationship which would not have been possible had they maintained total isolation.

Naomi’s narrative points to the dilemma facing many residents. She found that walls alone were ineffective against criminal activity and added an electric fence to her home. She will not give this up even though she finds walls ‘impersonal, feels like there’s no life there. It would be so much better if you could see your neighbour in his garden or on his verge … you would have more community participation. But with high walls everybody hides behind their walls, us included.’ And yet, in the same breath, Naomi feels that removing this physical barrier would be an “invitation” to criminals:

_I wouldn’t feel safe if all these walls were knocked down. Not with crime the way it is now. You know when you watch movies; America for instance, all those beautiful lawns, and that is how you grew up with lawns going right to the road. No fences, no wall. It would be lovely to live like that again. But I feel safe now with the electric fencing up._

Naomi’s narrative points to the ambivalence of many residents who, even if they don’t like walls, believe that they security and wellbeing are dependent on them.

While she dislikes living in a fortress-like home, Louis find CPTED principles ‘impractical’ and does not believe that there should be restrictions on the height and type of walls that people erect, 'not with the crime the way it is. People feel safer behind their walls although if there is a burglary nobody from the outside is going to notice it.’ This points to the quandary that many residents are confronted with.

**WALLS - A POLICE PERSPECTIVE**

In speaking about crime, the general perspective of the police is that walls are not a crime deterrent but in fact allow criminals time to enter residential homes and carry out robberies in privacy. Knowing that they can observed may discourage intruders from entering a property in the first instance, and if they do enter, this may limit the time that criminals spend at a property. However, W/O Percy pointed out, that, unfortunately, people's 'commonsense' beliefs govern their actions. Speaking at the UCPF meeting on 4 October 2012, Colonel Mkhize expressed concern about the fact that residents had ‘high walls and security and can’t even see their neighbours.’ He urged residents to be 'watchdogs' over their neighbours instead of being anonymous and not knowing what is going on in the neighbourhood. Captain Patrick noted at the same meeting that Umbilo's environmental design ‘has completely changed from what it was intended to be.’ With walls, ‘if you climb over a wall you are inside and the people who are inside are your captives because you cannot see from the outside what is happening inside.’ Patrick implored residents to 'improve
communication with your neighbours, report any suspicious behaviour to the police.’ W/O Percy also favoured greater visibility:

Say, for example, you are living in a fortress, your walls are like six meters high, you have got CCTV cameras on the inside and you can see outside. Now I am on the outside I can't see what is happening on the inside, they are undetected. You understand? A criminal can work in peace. So there is a plus and minus to it! If you want to secure your premises, make sure that you are visible. You see, the thing is to be clearly visible, you need to be visible to your neighbours. You can put up other security measures instead of building fortresses…. If you look at it in terms of house robberies, all the places that have been hit have got high security, all the businessmen that have been hit, just go and have a look at the houses, they are well secure, high fences. You see, criminals rely on stealth. So if he hops over the wall he is not visible from the street.

Percy believes that walls give homeowners a false sense of security. He points out that the 'real' criminals in South Africa are highly skilled and specialise in certain kinds of robberies, such as hijacking or house robberies, and have ways and means to overcome physical deterrents.

This police perspective on walls and crime is not confined to Ward 33 but appears to be a national one. A study of more than 30 thirty station commanders in the wider Johannesburg area found that they believed that walls made the fight against crime more difficult (Rauch, 1998). The study recorded comments such as the following:

‘People get a security company, they build high walls, get an armed response company, a little Rottweiler running around on their lawn and they don't care what's happening next door, they don't care what's happening in the streets. … I'm sick and tired of white people, because all they want to do is moan. They've got a very bad attitude. … There's a lot of people who have this perception of 'it's none of my business; I just want to survive; I'm just hanging on till I can emigrate.'

‘[High walls]. That's our biggest problem here; the neighbours don't know each other, they've got high walls and high fences.'

‘Walls - that can have an influence, that can assist crime, in a way, because the perpetrator is behind a wall and we cannot see him.'

‘All the companies that come up now have high walls so you don't really see what is happening inside those high walls. Of course you can't do patrols inside the company, you can just do patrols outside the company.'
Local private security companies, on the other hand, appear to have a mixed attitude to walls. Some favour walls as a means of securing one’s property. Speaking informally to a representative of a security company and looking at the website of a prominent security company in the area, it appeared that the key to avoid being a victim of crime is to deter potential criminals and the key to this is to ensure that one’s property is secure enough to persuade the potential criminals to move to a “softer” target. The website advises a layered approach, in which the first line of defence is the outer layer, ‘where you want to stop intruders – long before they get near to your family and possessions.’ Crucial in this outer layer are ‘walls and electric fences, trees and shrubs, dogs, outdoor sensors / beams and lighting,’ as well as CCTV. Walls play a huge part in the equation and the company suggests ‘razor wire or electric security fences around the entire perimeter of the house’ (Blue Security, 2012).

A (smaller) private security company employee operating in the ward had a slightly different perspective. Any house without a high wall or fence ‘will certainly be soft targets. I believe every home should have boundary walls and security gates.’ His idea of the ideal perimeter “wall” from a security perspective was ‘concrete columns with steel inserts and electric fencing’, coupled with ‘good lighting and a good burglar alarm system.’ This respondent was in favour of visibility but wanted the security of a solid structure, hence the choice of concrete columns. In fact, he stated that ‘from a security point of view, fencing is always better.’

These different philosophies between the public police and private security companies, as well as between members of different security companies, may be related to the fact that private companies are commercial enterprises and the more security private residents install, and the more homes that are connected to security companies, the more business there is for this burgeoning sector of the economy. The SAPS, on the other hand, places emphasis on community policing, and a key component of this strategy is for members of the local community to look out for each other. Likewise, smaller companies may prefer the involvement of other community members to assist in reducing crime.

**ALTERNATIVES TO WALLS**

Residents who choose not to have high walls are opting for other measures, such as alarms, dogs, landscaping, and improved lighting. Matt, who runs a self-catering unit in Umbilo, relies on the combination of dogs and (“see through”) barbed wire fencing for security. He had a break-in just before our interview in June 2012 which he blamed on ‘carelessness’:

*The only reason is that we moved our dog from one property to another due to one of our tenants being afraid of dogs. But the problem is they [robbers] came through my neighbour’s yard, which means they broke through his back gate and came over to mine. We’ve secured it now so, you know, we’re okay because even if they get into his yard, they can’t get into our yard because we’ve secured it [with fencing]. It’s the only time in four, five years and that’s only because we didn’t have a dog and weren’t secured from our neighbour’s yard. But now we are [secure].*
Matt’s property is not enclosed by a high wall but has fencing. He feels safe because ‘we’re pretty locked up, all burglar guarded so we are okay, you know.’ Susan, who manages Matt’s property, was at home when the robbery took place. Her dog, Lida was on the ‘opposite side of the house from where they broke in.’ Following the break-in, she points out, ‘we promptly went on Monday and bought two sensors to actually put by the gate where they infiltrating and we bought more barbed wire to put round the house. People next to me, they also has a break-in and then afterwards they got more security, people generally do that after it’s happened.’ Susan has great faith in her dog: ‘With her being in the room nobody will actually try and get into the room, you know, when there’s a huge big Great Dane lying in the passage way! I feel safe with my dog. She’s my biggest security.’

Several respondents valued dogs as a form of security as their bark gives advance warning. Dogs can also scare away potential criminals although there is always the danger that they could be poisoned or killed. In response to several attempted break-ins at her home, Amy, whose house has a substantial wall,

*got a little dog here. I don’t like dogs, I said rather the dog than the rogue. If it does see people walking past it will bark. [Now] we have cameras and we have got the fencing and we have got the walls, the gate. We have an alarm system. And now we have got the dogs. So I don’t know what more we can do. How much higher are we going to put up the wall? We have seven cameras. With the camera you can keep a watch at any time. There is another camera that goes up and there is one by the [washing] line area, two and one pointing to the granny flat, next to the garage there, that’s three. The other one, oh here, at the back door. So the back door one shows a little bit of next door at the wall. So if somebody is standing there at the wall, then you can see. I have got burglar guards throughout the house but I had it at the old house too but they still lifted it up - two nice pushes and it’s up and out. I mean, the trellidors, how safe are they? You hear about them just picking it up or even your drivewa
gate they derail it.*

As Amy’s example shows, crime has led to the commodification of private security and a massive growth in the industry in response to residents’ growing obsession about security. She has created a fortress-like home, which some may see as a deterioration in the quality of urban life even though she views this positively as a means of providing safety and security.

Ashley and Jessica also rejected the notion of building walls around their homes. Jessica has firm faith in her dogs and fence: ‘you see, we’ve got dogs, you’ve got to, in South Africa you’ve got to have dogs.’ She has not had a break-in since moving into Umbilo in 2000. At the time

*there was nothing. In fact, we never had tar – we had those two strips of concrete [driveway]. We had a little piece of wire – serious – actually a wire across there [fence]. We had nothing. We had a dog, we had bush then, we had occasional characters walking onto the actual property. They encountered the dog and it changed their mind.*
In 2003, Jessica built a fence around the house, which she described as ‘a normal fence with the barbed wire run on top.’ The decision to build the fence was taken in reaction to increased criminal activity in the area, even though she herself was not a victim of crime. Crime in the area included the theft of cars: ‘when we first [moved] here, a lot of cars used to be parked out [on the road] – they’ve [residents] all built their own little garages, they’ve put walls.’ In building the fence, Jessica reacted not to direct victimisation but to the perceived increase in crime in the neighbourhood and the general decline in the area resulting from demographic change. Jessica believes that her dogs and fence will suffice because much of the crime in the area is opportunistic. Organised criminals, she believes,

would rather go to Essenwood or Umhlanga or somewhere where there’s a huge mansion and they know that [there are] things inside there. They know where the money is, they’re not stupid. They know Hillcrest, Durban North, whatever, Umbilo – what they really going to get, a DVD? There’s nothing here so these [criminals] are normally the young boys that are like teenagers, nothing serious. I’ve never heard of anyone in this area poison the dogs and do a huge job.

Ashley, a woman in her seventies, moved into Umbilo in 1965. A widow, she has lived alone since her husband died in 2003. When Ashley moved into the house, ‘I didn’t even have burglar guards. I have now put burglar guard gates on the windows. I did have a security alarm which I got rid of. I found it pointless paying that money. For what? There’s always somebody at home. I just have my dogs now.’ She has plenty of them: ‘four big ones and six little ones.’
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The security measures adopted by the residents of Ward 33 appear to coincide with their respective fear of crime, their financial status, and specific location within the ward. As discussed in chapter two, advocates of CPTED argue that natural surveillance, which is achieved through measures such as increasing visibility through physical features, activities, and people; natural access control through landscaping, lighting, and fencing; and territorial reinforcement, that is, using fences, signs, buildings, pavements, and landscaping to express ownership, are a more effective method of preventing crime than physical barriers.

Those living in the northern part of Ward 33 (Glenwood) are generally economically better-off and this is reflected in the higher walls and more diverse security measures in this part of the ward. These include high walls, sometime lined with razor wire and/or electrified fences, alarms, surveillance cameras, infrared sensors, and motion detectors. Crime threats and security measures are relative, of course, and Cox's (2012) description of Johannesburg's northern suburbs is certainly not applicable to Ward 33:

Drive down many of Johannesburg's residential streets and you will catch glimpses only of roof tops, because the homes sit behind three-meter high security walls topped with electric fencing or barbed wire. There are sheds every few blocks with private security officers sitting guard and you likely will drive by a security patrol truck. Nearly every home has a sign board advertising it is protected by a private security company, which will respond 24 hours day with arms as needed.

Nevertheless, in discussing CPTED principles with respondents, when they were shown photographs of homes with walls and fences, some remained adamant that walls are indispensable to their security. They reason that whether criminals are acting rationally or randomly, their opportunities for criminal activity are reduced by making it difficult for them. The high walls around their homes, and those that they saw in the photographs, provide comfort and make them feel more secure. In environmental psychology, this concept is referred to as ‘territoriality’ which Gifford defines as ‘a pattern of behavior and attitudes held by an individual or group that is based on perceived, attempted, or actual control of a definable physical space, object, or idea that may involve habitual occupation, defense, personalization, and marking of it’ (Gifford, 2002: 150). In our context, it refers to the attempts of individuals to control space through defensive measures which provide them with psychological well-being and feelings of security.

Residents’ narratives are ambivalent in that even those advocating walls believe that they can be and sometimes are unappealing and that in an ideal world they would dispense with them. Both proponents and critics of walls point out that in many instances criminals are let in by people known to them, and once in, they are free to do as they please without interruption. While walls may provide a feeling of safety for some, they can, as Hansen points out at the beginning of this chapter, fortify residents’ fear of crime. He describes the walls as ‘melancholic’ because they are ‘manifestations of a lost form of social life.’ Several of the narratives pointed to a time past when it was not necessary to be “imprisoned” behind high walls. Walls perpetuate apartheid privilege. As Valji, Harris and Simpson (2004) point out, they are a barrier between
haves and have-nots and ‘can fuel resentment and a sense of injustice on one side of the wall, and a sustained sense of entitlement and privilege on the other. Both sentiments pose an obstacle to meaningful reconciliation.’ Walls divide neighbourhoods physically as well as socially and underscore the insecurities of residents within while trying to keep out those they fear.

Despite the fact that many residents continue to favour walls and other “target-hardening” devices, proponents of CPTED will continue to impress on other residents in the ward the benefits of a CPTED approach. Councillor Chapman would like to believe that his initiative in Bulwer Park will motivate others to think about different ways to reduce crime than to simply “hunker down” behind walls. As Chapman pointed out, this is not an exact science and the process will involve trial and error. It could include such things as closing certain streets, making others one-way, or changing the landscape. The likes of Chapman are aware that residents cannot do this individually; there has to be a concerted neighbourhood effort, possibly through the forums of Neighbourhood Watches, CPFs, and other civic groups. All initiatives must involve local planners, police, and all stakeholders in the ward.
CHAPTER SEVEN: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Who do you want to keep out when you build the wall, etc. gated communities, the same thing. Why do we want to have gated communities? Who do we want to keep out? Then the other thing you need to look at very, very strategically and ask yourself the question: Do people steal, rob because of poverty and they need to fill their stomachs, or do they do it with an ideology of vengeance, or are some of them just sick? So do you know what a topic you are dealing with? You can go crazy in terms of research. You can gather all this [information] and you can write and write and write.

- Captain Patrick

In a context where crime, violence, and police corruption are some of the issues that preoccupy South Africans in the post-apartheid period, and citizens who can afford to are taking precautions such as moving into gated communities or building high walls around their homes to protect themselves from a perceived crime scourge, this study investigated several related issues, using Ward 33 in KwaZulu-Natal as a study site. These issues include the causes of fear of crime; and how crime and the fear of crime are affecting the ways in which people are trying to make themselves safer in their own homes, affecting residents’ day-to-day behaviour and impacting on the suburban environment; and whether the mechanisms used to create safety are indeed producing feelings of greater safety and security. The research methodology employed for this study was mainly qualitative, in particular the use of photographs and storytelling, coupled with newspaper reports and census statistics.

Interest in this particular topic is strongly related to personal experiences. Growing up as a child in a middle class “Indian” area in the 1990s, home security systems increased incrementally in response to successive break-ins, eventually resulting in a permeable fence being built around the house. By the time two grand-aunts were murdered in their nearby home which did not have a fence or wall, my immediate family had relocated to Australia and for the next decade we lived in a suburb where houses did not have high walls or electric fencing, and people were generally lax about security even though there were occasional reports of a home in the neighbourhood being burgled.

The South Africa to which we returned in 2011 was very different to the one we had left. Illegal foreign migrants, refugees, police corruption, gated communities, high unemployment rates, and service delivery protests dominated media headlines and were part of everyday discourse. Furthermore, there are important changes in the suburbs that I was familiar with a decade earlier. In many instances, streets are blocked off to prevent access to “strangers”, armed security guards patrol neighbourhoods, and menacing-looking concrete walls, often with spikes, broken glass, or electric wire on the top, are an all too familiar sight. People are finding comfort, if only psychological, in the ostensible security provided by these new means of protection.

In Ward 33, many residents have fortified their homes with high walls and electric fencing, while those with less economic capital in Umbilo and the southern part of the ward are opting for open fences, low walls, or
no boundaries at all. A few more affluent residents of Ward 33 have consciously opted not to wall in their homes. These and other “target hardening” measures adopted by residents, such as armed patrols, burglar guards, and alarms, are very much at odds with my own undergraduate training as an urban planner where the theoretical and practical aspects of the course placed strong emphasis on the importance of security through physical design of the urban environment.

The methodology for this study involved the use of oral interviews (storytelling) and photography. While storytelling seems an obvious and important way to get to the “heart” of what is motivating individuals to act in certain ways, the use of photographs enhanced the study. This study did not use the technique of reflexive photography in the sense that respondents were asked to photograph those aspects of their neighbourhood that captured their attention in terms of crime and security, and to explain why they did so; rather, it relied on visual ethnography as the photographs were taken by myself and this visual material (photographs) was used as a “can-opener” to get the respondents to comment on and discuss their own choices regarding security as well as the choices made by others in the neighbourhood. My sense is that this led to greater enthusiasm for the subject amongst the respondents than would have been the case without photographs. It also possibly allowed them to see their walls and those of others in a different way from what they take for granted without reflecting on their choices. However, the fact that the photographs were not generated by the respondents did mean that they were not equal partners in the research process and that, despite my efforts to represent the ward, there is a greater possibility of bias since I chose the walls that we discussed.

Captain Patrick’s reflection at the beginning of this chapter raises pertinent questions about the causes of crime and fear of crime and also underscores the fact that research into issues around crime and the fear of crime are very complex and complicated. I have not quite gone ‘crazy’ as Captain Patrick warns, but it is challenging to make sense of the myriad of opinions and analyses from so-called experts as well as ordinary citizens that emerged in the course of the research for this study. Despite these challenges, this study provides valuable insight into crime and the fear of crime in Ward 33 and the security choices that residents are making.

The sources and extent of fear of crime vary amongst residents. Fear of crime emanates from the physical and social environment as well as the kinds of information shared within communities. It thus has a social (subjective) as well as statistical (objective) or legal basis. Agencies such as the police, security companies, Neighbourhood Watches, CPFs, and the media contribute to the “moral panic” amongst residents about crime by circulating information about criminal activity or potential criminal activity that increases residents’ perception that being a victim of crime is very likely. Other factors contributing to fear of crime are feelings of marginalisation and alienation among minority groups around issues of politics, economics, and work in the post-apartheid period; insecurities emanating from national and particularly international concerns resulting from globalisation and job insecurity, post-9/11 global tensions, and the 2008 global financial crisis; and urban decay and the presence of “undesirables”, including foreign nationals and students of colour, within the ward.
Embedded within the narratives is a strong association of race with crime, an assumption that is highly problematic in that the existing literature and crime statistics show that communities in (former) Black townships in South Africa are the hardest hit by crime and that the “crime scourge” is relative since other wards in the eThekweni area have higher rates of crime. The association of blackness with crime is deepening divisions due to its impact on residents’ attitudes to people of colour and also because the police are not immune to prejudiced views and opinions. The xenophobic tendencies detected in some police narratives in this study should be of concern to policymakers and community leaders as they seem to reflect a trend within the national police force that has resonance in other parts of the country, and which has been well documented.

Census statistics and crime statistics from Crime Stats SA as well as the SAPS indicate that, interviewees’ perceptions of crime risk and increased crime are not objectively warranted. It does not, however, matter in the short term whether fear of crime accurately reflects the reality of crime since fear of crime, due to the multiple sources of fear, is affecting residents’ behaviour and influencing the kinds of preventative measures that they are taking. As the (W.I.) Thomas theorem in Sociology explains it, ‘if men (people) define situations as real, they are real in their consequences.’ Reality is socially constructed and the behaviour of residents is shaped by what they believe and not necessarily by reality.

An important concern of this study was the “reality” of social cohesion in the specific location of Ward 33 and its impact on residents’ responses to fear of crime. Social cohesion, as used in this dissertation, refers to residents having common objectives and attachment to place. An important dimension of social cohesion is social capital, which refers to the networks that allow residents to act together in pursuit of common goals. Many academic studies suggest that diversity impacts on social cohesion by lowering trust, solidarity, cooperation, and networks. Most of the interviewees in the ward perceive it to have changed dramatically over the past two decades with regard to its demographic make-up, a fact reinforced by census statistics which show that people of colour make up a much higher percentage of the ward than previously.

The findings of this research study question whether heterogeneity automatically leads to reduced social cohesion. Rather than “hunkering down”, many residents of Ward 33 are actively engaged in various forms of civic action that is attempting to address the problems that they identify in the neighbourhood. Civic innovation is taking place through Neighbourhood Watches, business forums, the UAG, and the Bulwer Park upgrade. These instances of civic action are, on occasion, crossing racial, cultural, class, and ethnic boundaries, and they also involve linkages with a range of groups, including the business sector, and police and municipal officials. The key point here is that in modern society highly differentiated people cooperate on a daily basis to ensure that society runs smoothly. People do not have to be of the same race, class, or gender to work in pursuit of common goals. Demographic change, a feature of South African society over the past two decades in particular, does not have to extinguish social cohesion, if it existed in the first instance.

It is evident that the northern part of Ward 33 (Glenwood) is generally the more affluent part and this is reflected in the more diverse security measures such as high walls, sometimes lined with broken glass or...
razor barbed wire and/or electrified fences, and homes protected by alarms and security protocols, surveillance cameras, infrared sensors, and motion detectors. The walls are in part a reaction to loss of “security” under apartheid enforced segregation, but they are also a response to crime and the fear of crime. Photographs were valuable in eliciting responses because they allowed interviewees to see their own homes from a possibly different perspective, and they were able to compare their own boundary choices with those of others.

In discussing CPTED principles with respondents who have opted for high walls, they remained adamant that walls are indispensable to their security needs because they reduce opportunities for criminal activity. Walls are seen to provide comfort and security, and they give residents a sense of psychological well-being. In some instances, residents conceded that some of the walls are aesthetically unappealing, but they were adamant that they would only consider dispensing with them in an “ideal” world, that is, a secure and crime free world, which is not a description they could apply to post-apartheid South Africa.

Residents in the middle to lower income group tended to prefer fences which, they felt sufficed for their security, in conjunction with dogs and alarms systems. These residents valued the fact that their homes and properties were visible through the fencing and that neighbours and passers-by might therefore notice if intruders enter the property or they were under threat of any kind. Photographs reinforced this perception as, after viewing homes with high walls several interviewees suggested that even if they could not afford such walls, they would not opt for them. The security measures adopted by residents of Ward 33 appear to coincide with their respective fear of crime, their financial status, and their specific location within the ward.

While most residents within the ward are reluctant to break down their walls, there are exceptions, a prime example being Councillor Chapman, who tore down the wall around his home and urged fellow residents to do the same, espousing the benefits of a CPTED approach. He also put theory into practice by upgrading the local park.

**IMPLICATIONS OF THIS STUDY**

Councillor Chapman’s approach is in line with the growing global use of the built environment to increase security (CPTED) through maximising visibility, denying people access to potential targets through fences, lighting, and landscaping features that control movement in and out of particular areas, and increasing people’s sense of ownership of an area. The rationale of those secluding themselves behind high walls (with cameras, security companies, and other security added) appears to be to seek shelter in impregnable “fortresses”. Advocates of CPTED question what will happen when a criminal gets in and those on the inside are at their mercy. CPTED is based on the idea that crimes are less likely to occur when potential criminals are visible because others can intervene, report a crime, or even identify them in the event of a crime being committed. This “casual”, “informal” or “passive” surveillance is deemed important in preventing crime, as opposed to the “active” surveillance of security guards and cameras. Homes that are walled controvert this principle and probably place people at greater risk. “Breaking down walls” should, however, be part of a holistic strategy that aims to change the urban environment through measures such as mixed land use, mixed household types, connectivity, maximum use of the public realm, adequate public transport, and use of trees and grids.
Quite aside from their impact in relation to CPTED, the construction of walls is not a neutral act. Walls are built to keep some people inside and others outside, and in post-apartheid South Africa they are one means of perpetuating apartheid privilege by cementing the barrier between haves and have-nots in a context where there remains a strong correlation between race and class. By dividing neighbourhoods physically, walls also divide them socially. While apartheid produced artificially engineered and segregated urban development, fear of crime is now shaping a segregated and atomised urban space in the post-apartheid period through such developments as gated communities and walled homes.

The physical barrier of walls does much more than simply bound a home. In the first instance, walls reduce the possibility of direct contact between neighbours; contact which can lead to positive relationships. Walls are also a reminder to those on the outside of their status as an underclass. This is the case especially when those who come to the ward to work (at the factories, malls, hospitals, and as gardeners and domestic assistants) or to visit the hospital have to pass these walls almost daily and are constantly reminded of the divide in society. It may even be argued that the negative effect of walls around individual homes is greater than that of gated communities which are usually in secluded areas and passers-by usually see just one wall. Walls reinforce hierarchy and power. Those on the outside can only enter when those on the inside grant them permission to do so, reinforcing already unequal power relations. Walls also allow residents to block out the poverty and misery of their surrounding communities, perhaps making them immune to the immense suffering in their midst.

Given that walls and gated communities are mushrooming in most parts of South Africa, are there grounds for optimism? Many of the interviewees felt that the changing demographics of the ward are reducing contact and trust among residents and resulting in a loss of social cohesion. This suggests that many more people may barricade themselves behind walls in the future. While there is always anxiety about the colour of other people, in-migration of people of colour also presents an opportunity for the formation of new forms of contact, mixing, and social bonds.

While this chapter was being written, the *Sunday Times* (21 July 2013: 15-16) carried a story titled ‘If Jesus lived anywhere it would be here’. It was the story of Nigel Branken, a devout Christian who works in management at the University of the Witwatersrand, who left his upmarket Midrand home and moved with his wife Trish and their five children into an apartment in Hillbrow. On either side of the building in which he lives are “hijacked” buildings, a term used in South Africa to denote instances where tenants have taken over de facto “ownership” of a building from the legal owner. Over the past few decades, Hillbrow has acquired a reputation for being crime-ridden, full of illegal foreigners, and a haven for prostitutes, feelings echoed in Ward 33.

Asked how he survived crime in Hillbrow, Branken told reporter Jessica Eaton that ‘the best way to keep safe around here is to know as many people as you can. If you know people, they won’t hurt you.’ Daughter Hannah is thrilled with the move: ‘We have lots of friends here and most of them only live a floor up or down. In Midrand, my mom had to drive me to see my friends and we always had to make appointments. Here, they just pop in.’ Branken rallied members of the neighbourhood and they have written to the municipality to effect changes in the neighbourhood, such as improving the lighting, collecting rubbish, and
repairing the sewage. This “can do” attitude is evident amongst some residents of Ward 33 and suggests that there are people who are still motivated enough to make a change; not everyone is “hunkering down” as those who bemoan the decline of social cohesion suggest.

The example of Nigel Branken shows that coming into contact with people who are different in terms of class, race, religion, and ethnicity, may, over time, serve to break barriers and reduce suspicion among residents and thus increase trust and cooperation across barriers. Such contact does not have to result in conflict. Walls, walls, and more walls will counter efforts to break barriers. Of course, individual, isolated instances such as that of Branken will not solve the problem of crime and fear of crime. Branken knows that he cannot transform Hillbrow singlehandedly, and does not intend to, but he thrives in the neighbourhood, pointing out that ‘you come alive in this context. That is the purpose of life.’ With others in the neighbourhood he is working towards regenerating it.

The story of Nigel Branken is uplifting as it goes against what appears to be the common reaction to high crime rates, which is to fortify oneself against the outside world. Branken also raises the vexed question of poverty and inequality contributing to high crime rates in the country, a concern echoed by most interviewees in this research study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

While the South African and international literature does not point to a direct relationship between poverty and crime, almost all the interviewees identified extensive poverty as a cause of crime and an issue that should be addressed as a national priority. South Africa is amongst the most unequal societies in the world and it is likely that those who are indigent feel this inequality more intensely; this may increase petty and even property crime. Whether or not there is a direct relationship between poverty and crime is a moot point; joblessness has wide repercussions in terms of destroying entire communities and must be addressed. While this issue falls outside the scope of this study, it is noted here because respondents feel strongly about it.

While community involvement is not sufficient to stem crime and fear of crime, most residents believe that communities can play a positive role in supplementing the work of police and others involved in fighting crime. The reduction of crime and the fear of crime in Ward 33 depend on a symbiotic relationship between residents and law enforcement authorities. The present distrust between residents and the police is harmful. For their part, the police need to portray an image of competence. They can do so by increasing the regularity and quality of information about crime and policing (for example, through weekly newsletters) so that residents’ perceptions of them may become positive and residents may also act in ways that reduce their risk of being victims of crime. Such newsletters should go beyond identifying “hotspots” and providing other information that further increases fear of crime. Newsletters could be used to counter the media in general whose reports mostly heighten public suspicion and fear through sensationalist stories. There are too few “feel good” reports. The racial coding of crime through stories about foreign pimps and prostitutes and drug dealers produces negative racial and xenophobic attitudes. Greater transparency on the part of the police about the host of challenges they face will very likely generate empathy and understanding,
among residents and foster a positive relationship. The police must endeavour to be seen to be community-oriented, responsive, and proactive in order to increase public confidence in them. Xenophobic tendencies amongst some police officers also need to be addressed.

The larger an area, the more difficult it is to obtain cooperation and unity of purpose with regard to Neighbourhood Watches, foot patrols, and CPFs. It is therefore important that programmes are initiated on an on-going basis to maintain residents’ interest in crime prevention and community upgrade efforts. Effective Neighbourhood Watches and CPFs may increase residents’ feelings of security and “ownership” in an area as well as bring them closer together. Such organisations, that are instrumental in the sense that they are set up for specific purposes, are important because those who make the effort to join them do so in order to bring about positive change in the neighbourhood. In theory at least, they are committed to working together and also have a “feel” for the neighbourhood. If successful, such efforts may well reduce the desire of residents to move into gated communities; otherwise it is likely that many more people will join the exodus out of the neighbourhood. Increased residential instability, in turn, may further discourage formal and informal contact among residents of Ward 33, as well as between them and the police.

A theme running consistently through the literature and in some of the interviewees’ narratives is the effect of geography on how both residents and potential criminals view an area. Neighbourhood layout can influence the attitude of residents and potential criminals. Edward Hall wrote decades ago that ‘it must be impressed upon architects, city planners, and builders that if this country (United States) is to avoid catastrophe, we must begin seeing man as an interlocutor with his environment, an environment which these same planners, architects and builders are now creating with little reference to man’s proxemic needs’ (Hall, 1966: 6). These sentiments remain apposite. Councillor Chapman and other parties’ regeneration of Bulwer Park, and the neglect of other areas in Ward 33, such as Umbilo Park, illustrate the positive outcomes when a cross section of the local community is involved, and what can happen when there is neglect and dereliction, limited visibility and surveillance, and minimal control of public spaces by ordinary citizens or even the authorities.

Aside from visibility and improved visual appearances, the regeneration of neighbourhoods sends an important message that that area is one where residents choose to live; and, conversely, a powerful message to criminals that the residents of that area care about their neighbourhood and will protect it at all costs. The interviews revealed that when residents are satisfied with their neighbourhood they tend to develop an attachment to it and this can result in a more cohesive local community acting in concert to protect the space and help control crime in the area. In contrast, the “broken window” thesis posits that a broken window is taken as a sign that nobody really cares about the neighbourhood and this may lead to more “windows” being broken. There are currently many “broken windows” in Ward 33 which require attention so that the efforts of those who are working hard to maintain control of the ward and reduce crime and fear of crime are not negated. Unless this happens more residents may seek refuge behind walls or leave the area altogether.

From a safety and crime prevention perspective, it is important for parks and other public spaces to be visible; the same applies to houses where visibility allows neighbours and passers-by to generally keep
oversight of each other. Movement around the neighbourhood can be controlled by means of measures such as one-way streets, pavements, landscaping to define private spaces, adequate lighting, visible house numbers, and other such measures so as to make the movement of potential criminals around the neighbourhood more difficult, while allowing residents to have firm control of their spaces. On the other hand, building solid walls and residents barricading themselves indoors not only prevent others from seeing what is happening within private homes, but also generally lead to an absence of social activity in neighbourhoods and make movement easier for potential criminal activity. Greater activity and a social presence on the streets can play a role in deterring crime.

The findings of this study suggest that these ways of controlling crime and reducing fear of crime (CPTED) are preferable to measures such as additional surveillance, finding ways to exclude “others” from the neighbourhood, and adopting target hardening, especially by “hunkering” behind high walls. The thorny issue of foreign migrants and refugees also has to be tackled head-on and ways must be found to integrate such individuals into the neighbourhood or they will remain a thorn in the side of those attempting to address crime and the fear of crime.

Changing the mindset of those who build high walls or believe in the protection they provide, will not be easy. If a criminal or criminals really want to get in, walls will not prevent them from doing so. Several interviewees pointed out that, residents know this; it seems that walls provide a feeling of security rather than security itself - security against our anxieties and fears, possibly about the transition to the post-apartheid period and the uncertainties accompanying this. Costica Bradatvan (2011) expressed this very eloquently:

*Walls are built not for security, but for a sense of security. The distinction is important, as those who commission them know very well. What a wall satisfies is not so much a material need as a mental one. Walls protect people not from barbarians, but from anxieties and fears, which can often be more terrible than the worst vandals. In this way, they are built not for those who live outside them, threatening as they may be, but for those who dwell within. In a certain sense, then, what is built is not a wall, but a state of mind.*

Given this, the challenge to get residents to contemplate life without walls is enormous. However, if the police, security companies, policy planners, CPFs, Neighbourhood Watches, and other stakeholders work in concert, agree on the principles of CPTED, and try to get residents to embrace these principles, there is every reason to believe that change can occur. Since people are reluctant to completely ‘break down their walls’, they can be encouraged to adopt boundary fences and vegetation instead of huge fortresses. If nothing else, removing some of the walls will spare passers-by and other residents an ugly visual assault.

South Africa has long been known for its class and racial boundaries. It is one of the ironies of post-apartheid South Africa that as racial legislation fell, the walls and the boom gates went up. It was as if fear of the new had taken a stranglehold and that racially segregated neighbourhoods quickly translated into individual homesteads turning themselves into laagers. On the one hand, this knee-jerk reaction was
reinforced by the fear of crime. But behind the walls fear only festered and boiled as new forms of surveillance and security were called upon with each new story of crime.

This is not how it should be. The best security is to build a sense of community, of people watching out for one another, of street parties and parks where people share their joys and fears. One can witness the nascent consciousness of this in Ward 33 where some are realising that walls do not end fear, they exacerbate it. There is a need to build on this idea that the best antidote to crime and fear is not to build walls, but to build the community, and that networks of support rather than battalions of armed guards and the friendly neighbourly eye rather than the surveillance camera are the best ways to combat crime. John Donne’s (1572-1631) poem of several centuries ago remains as poignant as ever: ‘No man is an island, Entire of itself; Every man is a piece of the continent, A part of the main; If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less.’ People are all connected to one another and no individual can survive totally independent of others.

Change will not come about by pronouncements from on high. It will come from the people themselves, one street at a time. It is to this hope that this study speaks.
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Hillcrest, Ridge Road, Armed Robbery (25 January 2013, 21:33:14)
3 suspects gained entry into the premises via the front door and fired 6 shots at the resident which grazed his head. Suspects then stole 2 bags, 5 cell phones, a camera, 4 rings, a chain, an undisclosed amount in cash, Mercedes keys and the house keys and then fled in the Resident’s white Golf 6 NJ 192576 in an unknown direction.

Westville, Northbourne Avenue, Armed Robbery (26 January 2013, 12:36:00)
Armed suspects jumped over the electric fence and held residents up at gunpoint inside the house. Suspects fled with the residents silver Mercedes, ND 54769. An undisclosed amount of cash was stolen from the safe, cellphones and wallets containing credit cards were also stolen.

Westville, Dawn Crescent, Armed Robbery (27 January 2013, 18:23:14)
8 suspects, some dressed with civilian clothing and some in police uniforms, armed with 9mm’s and 8mm’s followed resident into the premises with 2 vehicles, a white Golf 5 with SABS branding and a white BMW, which had blue lights and held them up. Suspects tied them with cable ties and ransacked the entire premises. A large amount of cash, 2 computers, a firearm and 9 cellphones were stolen.

Glenmore, Grosvenor Road, Armed Robbery (27 January 2013, 20:05:29)
3 armed suspects jumped over the fence and entered the premises via a sliding door. The suspects stole a cellphone and exited the building. When the Resident spotted them, one of the suspects fired a shot into the ground outside the premises and fled.

Mayville, Bellair Road, Housebreaking - Business (27 January 2013, 01:42:12)
Suspects forced the extractor fan off the wall from the rear of the premises and gained entry. An undisclosed amount of cigarettes was stolen.

Glenwood, Clarke Road, Housebreaking - Business (27 January 2013, 13:09:23)
Suspects cut the razor wire fencing and then broke into the second garage door. A compressor and a hose pipe were stolen.

Berea, Bellevue Road, Housebreaking - Business (28 January 2013, 07:07:18)
Suspects forced open one of the rear offices. A laptop, camera, bag and clothing were stolen.

Umhlo, Rick Turner Road, Theft (09 February 2013, 07:45:18)
Suspects stole copper pipes and 2 taps from the rear of the premises.

Westmead, Moss Road, Theft (09 February 2013, 09:39:29)
Suspects drilled the front driveway gate and forced open a padlock to the power box at the side of premises and stole copper cables.

Glenmore, Levenhall Road, Attempted Robbery (03 February 2013, 11:28:12)
2 suspects entered the property and then came into the kitchen and attacked the resident. She managed to free herself and screamed for help. The suspects then fled and were apprehended and handed over to Umbilo SAPS.

Glenmore, Levenhall Road, Attempted Robbery (03 February 2013, 11:24:23)
2 suspects entered the property and then came into the kitchen and attacked the resident. She managed to free herself and screamed for help. The suspects then fled and were apprehended and handed over to Umbilo SAPS.

Umbilo, Shelly Place, Attempted Robbery (27 November 2012, 14:14:01)
A suspect was apprehended on the resident’s property busy removing the battery from the gate motor. The suspect was arrested and taken into custody.
Glenwood hijackings

Women share their ordeals

Be vigilant at all times

TWO brave Glenwood women who both survived hijackings at gunpoint in the area this month share their stories hoping the community will be more vigilant.

Rosninee Bhagwaddeen and her son Shavir were returning home after she had fetched him from college last Thursday afternoon, 14 February when their traumatic incident occurred.

“We passed the Berea Road Spar and turned down Moore Road into the road where my garage is situated. She didn’t want to specify as the hijackers have her car key.”

“My son opened the garage door and I pulled the car in switched off and got out of the car with my cellphone, car keys and handbag. My heart sank when I turned to see my son being held by two men with a gun, inside my garage.”

The distraught mother said she was supposed to meet her husband at home and was hoping that he didn’t come into the garage to check what was holding them up. The one man demanded her wedding ring, watch and sunglasses while the other ruffled her son’s pockets taking two cellphones, his wallet and bag containing his books.

“I told them to just take everything and leave my handbag because it contained my personal documents and my jewellery which I hadn’t removed from a weekend away,” she said.

The men told them not to look at their faces and cocked the gun. “If you want to be clever you’ll get killed,” Shavir recalled them saying before they got into the car to reverse out of the garage.

“When they tried to reverse the park assist started beeping and they asked us to get into the car because they thought it was a tracking device, but we explained it was because the car was in reverse and they left us.”

Shavir jumped through the garage window, injuring himself in a bid to find help and asked their flat caretaker to assist.

Rosninee’s husband tried to call her when he saw the car drive past and immediately called Netstar to track the vehicle before calls were made to the police.

“It was about 14.28pm when he called Netstar and at 14.42pm, while we were at the police station, they were able to find our car abandoned on Pyton Street Chesterville, 15 minutes after the assailant.”

“We are really thankful to many people at Unhilo SAPS and Netstar who helped us during this traumatic experience. Trainee Officer Chencos, Warrant Officers de Beer, Du Plessis, Captain Dias, Constable Hlongwana and Njumalo and Netstar control ground team, Pasbud Box and Bredenb Horns.”

The next day a lady named Marylin Saunders called my husband saying her maid found a handbag on the road, the woman saw our Shibya card and told them the situation about finding my bag with personal belongings so they gave her our contact number and within a day we met and I had my wallet with drivers licence and bank card.”

Rosninee said she was overwhelmed by the community support. “It is so nice that she got involved. My ID and driver’s licence could have been lying somewhere on the road.”

“Our faith in human kind is restored. Usually when awful things like this happen there is so bright side but its all water under the bridge. Our lives have been spared. I just hope people will be more vigilant then ever before.”

Rosninee said people should make sure they changed their routines as this could contribute towards becoming an easy target.

Grateful to be alive

BARBARA Coll, a Glenwood interior designer was just as lucky to walk away with her life after a hijacking on Monday morning 4 February also in Glenwood.

“I was on my way home from visiting a family member, my car broke down when I was turning from Nicholson Road into Rhodes Avenue and I took my cellphone out to call my husband to fetch me.”

Coll tried to explain where she was when she was confronted by two men with a gun. “I was on the phone when these two men ran up to me with a gun and snatched my cellphone.”

“I didn’t know what to do in a situation like that, I fought them, which was silly in hindsight but adrenalin kicked in and I grabbed my handbag and ran to the nearest door I could find while they got into the car and tried to drive off,” she said.

Her vehicle stalled again a short distance away and the men abandoned the vehicle. She was lucky a man opened the door to her and both her and her husband were very kind to her.

Coll said could not understand how the men could be running around with a gun at 11.30am.

“It was a terrifying experience and I hope that nobody has to go through that.”

“I spent the rest of the day reporting the incident and paramedics said I needed to get to a hospital to check my blood pressure which had gone so high. It is sad to have to live in this country where life is too cheap. I’m grateful to be alive to tell the tale,” she said.

Coll is currently going for counselling and has been to the doctor for her injuries.

“People must be aware and careful even early in the morning,” she added.
APPENDIX C: CRIME TRENDS – FACEBOOK
SAPS UMBILO STATION PROFILE

Umbilo Police Station patrol area is approximately 22 square kilometers and has a population of 150,000 (done at the time of the last census, prior to 2011). Umbilo has a daily influx of approximately 963,206 (attached proof of daily influx figures). Umbilo has an unemployment rate of approximately 40%.

Umbilo consists of:

- 45 Schools
- 4 Railway Stations
- 30 Churches
- 65 Parks
- 1 International Hockey Stadium (Queensmead Stadium)
- 5 Night Clubs
- 10 Sports Bars
- 112 Liquor outlets
- 1100 Industrial premises
- 130 Blocks of flats
- 30,000 Residential dwellings
- 5 Taxi ranks (of which one is a long distance rank)
- 1 Hostel (Dalton Hostel)
- 8 Tertiary education facilities which includes University of KZN and the Nelson Mandela Medical School
- 2 Hospitals (King Edward Hospital and St Augustines Hospital)
- 4 Major Shopping Centres (Davenport Centre, Berea Centre, Buxtons (Glenwood Village) and Queensmead Mall)
- 35 Scrap yards and second hand goods dealers
- 1 Cemetery (Stellawood Cemetery - Largest in the Southern hemisphere)
- Department of Home Affairs
- 7 Old Age Homes
- 1 Library
- NPA Licencing Office (Stellawood Licencing)
- 1 British Consulate
- 1 Danish Consulate
- 1 Fire Station
- 3 Post Offices
- 1 Department of Education Centre
- 1 Medico Legal Laboratory (Gale Street Mortuary)

All major banks:
- Standard Bank, Nedbank, ABSA, FNB (Brand Road)
- Standard Bank (Gale Place)
- Capitec Bank (Berea Centre and Magwaza Maphalala Road)
The Umbilo Action Group:
This is a group that was established by persons who were not happy with the previous Community Policing Forum and emanated from the Sector 4 Community Committee.
The group is made up of mainly White members of the Community.
The known members are: Vanessa Burger, Barry Bolter and Michelle Murphy.
(Michelle Murphy was previously elected Chairperson of the CPF but was ousted due to vote rigging).

Influx of Foreign Nationals into Umbilo:
The Umbilo patrol area has had a huge influx of Foreign Nationals since the establishment of the Home Affairs Department which is situated in Che Guevara Road (Moore Road).

There are approximately 2000 Foreign Nationals living under the bridge at the cnrs of Che Guevara Road and Maydon Road which was displaced from Albert Park.
(The railway lines runs along Maydon Road and undocumented persons enter from that side at night to break into business premises at night and early hours of the morning. Trucks are also parked there over night and attracts prostitutes.)

There is a growing number of Foreign Nationals who are establishing businesses and other who are purchasing and/or renting premises within the Umbilo patrol area.
APPENDIX E: COMPARISON OF CRIME BETWEEN UMBILO, UMLAZI AND HILLCREST

### Murder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precincts</th>
<th>Hillcrest</th>
<th>Umbilo</th>
<th>Umlazi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of (in 2012)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attempted murder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precincts</th>
<th>Hillcrest</th>
<th>Umbilo</th>
<th>Umlazi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of (in 2012)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Illegal possession of firearms and ammunition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precincts</th>
<th>Hillcrest</th>
<th>Umbilo</th>
<th>Umlazi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of (in 2012)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theft out of or from motor vehicle

- Hillcrest: 200
- Umbilo: 600
- Umlazi: 200

Driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs

- Hillcrest: 200
- Umbilo: 350
- Umlazi: 200

Shoplifting

- Hillcrest: 180
- Umbilo: 120
- Umlazi: 120
### Carjacking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precincts</th>
<th>Number of (in 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbilo</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umlazi</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assault with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precincts</th>
<th>Number of (in 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbilo</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umlazi</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX F: EXAMPLE OF ENTRIES MADE BY POLICE

### MONTH: AUGUST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>YEAR/JAAR</th>
<th>2. FULL NAME AND SURNAME (in block letters)</th>
<th>3. VOLLE NAAM EN VAN (in block letters)</th>
<th>4. AGE OUERDOM</th>
<th>5. ARREST ARRES</th>
<th>5.1 DATE DATUM</th>
<th>5.2 TIME TYD</th>
<th>5.3 OFFENCE MISDAAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td>CARIAN KHITON ALFRED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>JACQUIAN VELI                           26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05/30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>YASEEM KARIM                           22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>JEFFERSON BENZIL Broxorn                29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>NERDICHAROS                              37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAVEL GREGORY                          21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuan Jami/Frances                        18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22:13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assault, Theft MIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quinton Bapenga Rehenga                 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02/01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft 07/00 MV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hussain Ali                             19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:54</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft Poss 07/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramadhani Salum                         30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15:54</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft Poss 07/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>RIYANDH EBRAHIM                         19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft Poss 07/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mokhotlhi Sitho                        39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft Poss 07/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Siphamuady Pillethuse                   24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22:40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft 07/00 MV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne Pillay                            27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22:40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theft 07/00 MV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mako Richard Gumbi                      31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drunk Driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sipho                                 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandile Stansicase                      22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possession of Hea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moses Lubwoni                           23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17:40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possession of Hea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teddy Madikizela                       40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drunk Driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nlanhlwa Khengu                        44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18:37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possession of Hea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX G: SUMMARY OF RESULTS

### CRIME STATISTICS: UMBILO POLICE STATION (August - October 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME</th>
<th>BLACK AFRICAN</th>
<th></th>
<th>INDIAN</th>
<th></th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLOURED</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Robbery</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>84.94</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70.59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Theft</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagga</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroine</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House breaking</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk Driving</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86.49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reckless and Neglient Driving</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>96.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregard of red robot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal crossing of railway line</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructing police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal use of firearm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbance of peace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence and intimidation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIME</td>
<td>BLACK AFRICAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>INDIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td>COLOURED</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal crossing of railway line</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructing police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal use of firearm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbance of peace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence and intimidation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed robbery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlicensed MV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted murder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pointing of a firearm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possession of dangerous weapon / firearm</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijacking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal immigrants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to escape custody</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol in public - drinking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act 56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss/Negligence of firearm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to produce driver's licence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molesting (sexual harrassment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening / pointing firearm at cop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to report accident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious damage to property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlicensed driver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX H: WARRD 33 CRIME STATISTICS (2005-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault Common (raw)</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault GBH (raw)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder Attempted (raw)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Residential (raw)</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>183.5</td>
<td>152.1</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>146.7</td>
<td>131.6</td>
<td>152.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpable Homicide (raw)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug-related crime (raw)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Theft (raw)</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>1172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>419.8</td>
<td>357.5</td>
<td>295.7</td>
<td>272.8</td>
<td>238.4</td>
<td>266.2</td>
<td>246.2</td>
<td>276.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal possession of firearms and ammunition (raw)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious damage to property (raw)</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder (raw)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Violence (raw)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Aggravated Total (raw)</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>119.6</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>123.1</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>152.8</td>
<td>134.4</td>
<td>146.7</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Carjacking (raw)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery Common (raw)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of motor vehicle and motorcycle (raw)</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>208.7</td>
<td>222.1</td>
<td>205.6</td>
<td>163.2</td>
<td>145.3</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft out of or from motor vehicle (raw)</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>163.9</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>130.6</td>
<td>147.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sexual Crimes (raw)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total subcategories aggravates robbery forming part of aggravated robbery above (raw)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per population (1:10000)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY RACE

Space-Time Research
Dwellings

Annual household income by Population group of head of household
for Household weighted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>Indian or Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No income</td>
<td>1874217</td>
<td>106000</td>
<td>30889</td>
<td>153840</td>
<td>12587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1 - R 4800</td>
<td>612969</td>
<td>22303</td>
<td>3113</td>
<td>7949</td>
<td>2417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 4801 - R 9600</td>
<td>1002979</td>
<td>40649</td>
<td>5587</td>
<td>12410</td>
<td>4726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 9601 - R 19 600</td>
<td>2235338</td>
<td>147738</td>
<td>26958</td>
<td>54386</td>
<td>10813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 19 601 - R 38 200</td>
<td>2402967</td>
<td>204719</td>
<td>34912</td>
<td>83781</td>
<td>14215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 38 201 - R 76 400</td>
<td>1481740</td>
<td>193822</td>
<td>47700</td>
<td>144392</td>
<td>11581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 76 401 - R 153 800</td>
<td>867366</td>
<td>147626</td>
<td>59999</td>
<td>251968</td>
<td>8697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 153 801 - R 307 600</td>
<td>516711</td>
<td>108772</td>
<td>61365</td>
<td>351421</td>
<td>7024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 307 601 - R 614 400</td>
<td>254928</td>
<td>61069</td>
<td>47044</td>
<td>317677</td>
<td>4645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 614 001 - R 1 228 800</td>
<td>70331</td>
<td>16892</td>
<td>20695</td>
<td>159079</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1 228 801 - R 2 457 600</td>
<td>23798</td>
<td>3933</td>
<td>5808</td>
<td>45764</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2 457 601 or more</td>
<td>17024</td>
<td>2502</td>
<td>3052</td>
<td>23615</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Language by Population group

for Person weighted, 59500033: Ward 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>Indian or Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>2539</td>
<td>10411</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IsiNdebele</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IsiXhosa</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IsiZulu</td>
<td>6651</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign language</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiSwati</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshivenda</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xitsonga</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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